THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY

Ex Libris
Davidis Miller Kay
Professoris Sanctiandreæ
MCMII—MCMXXX

Walter Stewart
March 1895.

THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY

(25)

EDITED BY THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., ORIEL PROFESSOR OF INTERPRETATION, OXFORD; AND THE REV. A. B. BRUCE, D.D., PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS AND NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

VOL. III.

KITTEL'S HISTORY OF THE HEBREWS. VOL. I.

A HISTORY
OF
THE HEBREWS

By R. KITTEL
ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BRESLAU

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND HISTORY OF
THE PERIOD UP TO THE DEATH OF JOSHUA

TRANSLATED BY
JOHN TAYLOR, D.Lit., M.A.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE
14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON
AND 20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH
1895

Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable, Printers to Her Majesty

PREFACE BY THE EDITOR

The selection of the present work as the first in this series which deals with the Old Testament has been made with special reference to the actual condition of critical studies in England. Long and arduous efforts have been required to naturalise Old Testament criticism among us, but our students still find great difficulty in mastering methods and assimilating results. The deliberateness of Professor Kittel's procedure and the comparative conservatism of his conclusions (so far as they are presented here) should ensure his work a cordial reception among us, while the attention which he has given to archæological data furnish one more proof that Old Testament criticism has passed for good and all out of the purely literary stage which lasted from Eichhorn to Colenso.

It was necessary to premise this to save the reader from two possible disappointments:—1. The title, 'History of the Hebrews,' might lead him to expect a narrative, fragmentary perhaps, but undisturbed by discussion, of the outer and inner history of the Israelitish people. For such a narrative he will seek in vain in Professor Kittel's work; but in lieu of it he will in general find something which for him may perhaps be more useful, viz., careful and honest discussions of the limits and

character of the sources, and of the inferences to be drawn from them, carried on with an earnest desire not to deviate more than is absolutely necessary from tradition. Certainly, the author's treatment of the traditions respecting Moses and the Mosaic religion, however much we may differ from his conclusions, is worthy of the most respectful consideration.

2. The reader who desires to avoid more unlearning than is necessary, and to start from the point actually reached by investigation, might naturally suppose that Professor Kittel assumes the position of most cautious and moderately advanced critics in 1888-1892. Such most assuredly is not the case. Vols. I. and II. of Kuenen's *Onderzoek*—a work which for its combined caution and consistency is unrivalled among text-books—were published in 1885-1889, and how wide is the difference in some important respects between the criticisms of this work and that of Professor Kittel's! But let not the English Church-student disparage the latter on that account. There are many compensations in the slow, deliberate process of English theological development. And as a help in the inevitable transition, there is perhaps no better book than that of this devout Churchman and former pastor, Professor Rudolf Kittel.

T. K. CHEYNE.

OXFORD, *January* 1895.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

SHORTLY after the appearance of the first volume of the *History of the Hebrews*, and still more after the second had appeared, the author was repeatedly asked by English-speaking scholars to allow the book to be translated into English, so that it might be accessible not only to the learned but also to the wider circle of students and of clergy and laity in England who are interested in the Old Testament. I have readily complied with this wish, and my pleasure in doing so has been increased by the fact that the publishers, Messrs. Williams & Norgate, were able to inform me that the translation would be made under the experienced guidance of Professor T. K. Cheyne. I am bound to offer here my earnest thanks to the distinguished Oxford scholar for all the care and pains he has taken with reference to the book.

For those readers who are not acquainted with the book in its German form, I venture to observe that the first volume appeared in 1888 and the second in 1892. In the present English Edition I have made additions to a considerable number of passages. Yet it cannot altogether be denied that the first volume represents the position of affairs six years ago rather than that of to-day. Those who are conversant with the topics it discusses know quite well that if I had wished to obliterate all traces of the difference I should have had to revise the volume throughout. Although this has not been done, I hope that something may yet be learned from the book.

I have called it a 'History of the Hebrews,' because its aim is to write the history of the ancient *Hebrew* people, from their first beginnings up to the time when, first in Babylonia and then in Palestine, they pass over into the small community of *Judaism*. Hereafter I may perhaps be able to supplement the *History of the Hebrews* with one of the Jews.

The book differs from other works of a like kind by the large amount of space devoted to the investigation of the sources. To many of my readers this will seem to be carried to an excess. Perhaps they may alter their opinion when they remember that it is impossible to build with a good conscience until you have assured yourself as to the nature of the ground on which you would build, and the fitness of the materials for the use to which you would put them.

RUDOLF KITTEL,
Doctor and Ordinary Professor of Theology.

Breslau, 21*st February* 1894.

THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS

AT.	Old Testament.
Bädek.[2] . . .	Palästina und Syrien. Handbuch für Reisende. Herausgegeben von K. Bädeker. 2 Aufl. 1880 (bearbeitet von Socin). The references are to the pages of the first English Edition.
Bib.-Lex. . . .	Bibellexikon, Realwörterbuch zum Handgebrauch, u.s.w., herausgegeben von D. Schenkel, Leipzig, 1869-1875.
Bleek[4] . . .	Einleitung in das Alte Testament von Friedr. Bleek. 4 Aufl. von Wellhausen, 1878.
Dillm. *ExLev* . .	Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus. Neu bearbeitet von A. Dillmann, 1880.
Dillm. *Gen.*[5] . .	Die Genesis. Erklärt von A. Dillmann. 5 Aufl. 1886.
Dillm. *NuDtJo* . .	Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua. Neu bearbeitet von A. Dillmann, 1886.
Ebers, *ÄgBMo* . .	Ägypten und die Bücher Mose. Sachlicher Kommentar zu der ägyptischen Stellen in Genesis und Exodus. Von Georg Ebers, I. 1870.
Ebers, *Gosen*[2] . .	Durch Gosen zum Sinai. Aus dem Wanderbuch und der Bibliothek. Von Georg Ebers. 2 Aufl. 1881.
Ew. *Gesch. Isr.* . .	Geschichte des Volkes Israel. 1 Aufl. 1843ff. ; 2 Aufl. 1851ff. ; 3 Aufl. 1864ff.
HWB.	Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums für gebildete Bibelleser. Herausg. von Ed. Riehm, 1874-1884.
JDTh.	Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.
JPTh.	Jahrbücher für Protestant. Theologie.
Köhler (*Bibl.*) *Gesch.* .	Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte des alten Testaments von A. Köhler, 1875 ff.
Kuen., *Ond*[2] (*O*[2]) .	Historisch-critisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds door A. Kuenen. 2 Uitg. I. 1, 1885.
PRE[2]	Realencyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche. 2 Aufl. von Herzog-Hauck-Plitt. Leipzig, 1877-1888.

Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*	Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments von Ed. Reuss, 1881.
Ritter, *Erdk.*	Erdkunde im Verhältniss zur Natur und Geschichte des Menschen. Von C. Ritter, 1850 ff.
Schrader, *KAT*[2]	Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament von Eberh. Schrader. 2 Aufl. 1883, Eng. Trans. The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament, 1885, 1888.
Schrader, *KGF*	Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung von Eb. Schrader, 1878.
StKr	Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
ThStW	Theologische Studien aus Würtemberg.
Wellh. *Einl.*[4]	*See* Bleek[4].
Wellh. *Gesch. Isr.*	Geschichte Israels von J. Wellhausen. 1 Band, 1878.
Wellh. *Prol.*[2]	Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels von J. Wellhausen. 2 Ausgabe der Geschichte Israels. Bd. i., 1883. Eng. Trans., Prolegomena, etc., 1885.
Wellh. xxi., xxii.	Wellhausen in the Jahrbüchern für Deutsche Theologie, Bd. xxi. und xxii.
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
ZDPV	Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästinavereins.
ZKWL	Zeitschrift für kirkliche Wissenschaft und kirklichen Leben.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

§ 1. Interest of the Subject and Method of Treatment . 1

§ 2. Scientific Works on Hebrew History . . . 5

§ 3. Israel's Land and its Products 8

1. The Land 8

2. Climate, Flora and Fauna . . . 15

§ 4. The Inhabitants and Neighbours of Canaan . . 18

1. The Inhabitants 18

2. Israel's Neighbours 23

BOOK I

THE PERIOD ENDING WITH THE CONQUEST OF CANAAN.

A.—*SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON THIS PERIOD.*

I.—*The Old Testament Hexateuch*

§ 5. Tradition and its Authority 27

§ 6. History of Criticism 36

First Period. To K. H. Graf . . . 36

Second Period. Since Graf . . . 43

PAGE

§ 7. Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic Fragments . . 48
1. The Compilation of the extant Book of Deuteronomy. The Original Kernel . . 48
2. Date of the Composition of D . . . 57
3. The Deuteronomic Fragments in the Book of Joshua 66

§ 8. The Sources J and E. Their relation to each other and to D 69
1. Relation to Deuteronomy . . . 70
2. Relation to each other. Their Combination . 72
3. Priority 76
4. Age and Origin 81
5. Sources of E and J 90

§ 9. The Priestly Writing 96

§ 10. Continuation. The grounds on which P is considered Post-Exilic 107
1. Archæological Considerations:—Place of Divine Worship. Sacrifices. Festivals. Priests and Levites 107
2. Literary and Linguistic Considerations . . 124
3. Result 131

II.—*The Remaining Sources*

B.—*HISTORY OF THE PERIOD.*

§ 11.

CHAPTER I

THE PATRIARCHAL AGE

I.—*The Tradition in the Sources*

§ 12. E's Narrative 136
1. Abraham 136
2. Isaac 140

PAGE

3. Jacob 141
4. Joseph 144

§ 13. J's Narrative 147
1. The Yahvist 147
2. Abraham 149
3. Isaac 153
4. Jacob 154
5. Joseph 157

14. The Priestly Writing and its Editing . . . 161
1. The Priestly Writing 161
2. The Editor 165

II.—*The Historical Substance of the Patriarchal Story*

15. The Patriarchs in General 168

§ 16. Abraham 172

§ 17. The Original Home of Abraham and the Hebrews . 180

§ 18. The Immigration of the Hebrews into Egypt . . 183

§ 19. The Personality of Joseph 186

CHAPTER II

MOSES AND THE JOURNEY THROUGH THE DESERT

I. *The Tradition in the Sources*

§ 20. J's Narrative 192
1. To the Arrival at Sinai 192
2. The Events at Sinai 197
3. The End of the Journey through the Desert . 200

PAGE

§ 21. E's Narrative 203
1. To the Arrival at Sinai 203
2. The Events at Sinai 207
3. The End of the Journey through the Desert 212

§ 22. The Narrative Material of P. 215

II. *The Historical Substance of the Story of Moses*

§ 23. The Statements of the Old Testament . . . 222
1. A Summary View 222
2. The Passage of the Red Sea . . . 225
3. The Fight with Sihon 228
4. The Forty Years in the Desert . . . 231
5. The Events at Sinai 232
6. The Camping Grounds. The Number of the People. The Tabernacle . . . 236

§ 24. The same Subject continued—Moses and his religion . 238
1. Moses a Historical Personage . . . 238
2. Moses as Legislator and Founder of a Religion . 240
3. Whence came his knowledge of God? . . 249

§ 25. Foreign Accounts 252
1. Tell el Maskhuta 253
2. The Pharaoh of the Exodus . . . 256

CHAPTER III

THE CONQUEST OF CANAAN.

§ 26. The Survey of the Conquest in Judges i. and ii. 1-5 . 264
1. The Text 264
2. The Division of the Land, and Joshua . . 270
3. Result 275

PAGE

§ 27. The Conquest of Canaan, up to the Alliance with Gibeon, according to the Book of Joshua . . . 278

1. Joshua at the Head of all Israel . . . 279
2. Joshua at the Head of the House of Joseph . 285

§ 28. The Historical character of the Narrative . . 291

1. The Mode of Invasion 292
2. The Several Events 297

§ 29. The Events that followed the Alliance with Gibeon . 302

1. The Battle of Gibeon 302
2. The Rest of the Narratives . . . 308

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *The Interest of the Subject. The Method of Treatment.*

The interest which is aroused by the history of the Hebrew race is of varied kinds. The sympathy which man naturally feels with his fellows, and the impulse which moves us to psychological observation, would of themselves suffice to awaken a more than ordinarily strong desire to trace out the fortunes of this people. For it is a people which has had vitality enough to weather all the storms of the history of mankind and a thousand sufferings peculiar to itself. And its tenacious clinging to its own nationality and to its hereditary peculiarities still presents the most perplexing of problems to the statesman and the student. Nor is that all. When we endeavour to grasp the influence which its history has exercised over the other nations, nay, over the whole world and its fortunes, feelings of interest of a still loftier kind at once assert themselves.

Although the history of man's spiritual life since the beginning of our era has been largely affected by the ideas that flowed from Greece and Rome, it has received from no quarter a stronger or more lasting fertilising energy than from the small land of Judæa. But the spirit creates for itself its own forms in external life. Christianity, the embodiment of these new thoughts, has not been content with drawing into its province the faith, the mode of thought, the moral habits of the nations. It has also taken possession of their outward life, their culture and their politics, giving to these the form it would. There is hardly an event of

true significance in the history of the nations touched by Christianity, the genesis and development of which can be shown to be unaffected by these fundamental facts.

The religion of Jesus of Nazareth, or rather, the work He wrought, comprehending, as it did, the whole world and the entire life of man, did not grow simply out of the soil of Judæa and the religious characteristics of the nation to which He belonged. The Nature and, yet more markedly, the teaching of the Founder of the Christian religion, have their deepest roots in the past of His people and the ideas which the Old Testament supplied. The deeper our inquiry into the sources of our own faith the more intimately will it come into contact with the thoughts of Hebrew antiquity. The part played by the Hebrew race has been that of a seed-plot for ripening the fruit of the new ideas that were destined to conquer the world. But seed-plot and fruit are always very closely related. The elements of which the plant is formed are hidden in the soil and ready at any time to come into action. They need only a new germ of life to quicken them into development and give them their predestined shape. Islam also has drawn its best parts from these sources.

Israel has reached this altogether peculiar position, which is not even distantly approached by any other people, through its religion, its idea of the Divine. Not its religion in the abstract, apart from the rest of its national life. We mean rather its religion as standing in the closest connection, the most vital and palpable reciprocity, with the national character; on the one hand determined in part and matured by the idiosyncrasies and the fortunes of the people, and on the other determining and visibly influencing them itself.

No power on earth is equal to the influence of religious life. It is this which has made the Hebrew race so great and given it a still perceptible influence. The Phoenicians who settled near them might traverse lands and seas, heaping up the treasures of three continents. The dwellers by the Nile and the Euphrates might reduce half the world to subjection. Greece, by its philosophy

and the imperishable creations of its art, Rome, by the genius that fashioned laws and states, might make for themselves a name in history. The Hebrew race towers far above them in its enduring, far-reaching influence on the fortunes of the nations and the cast of their thought. Infinitesimally small as is its native land, insignificant as are its possessions and its external dominion, yet it has exercised a unique power over the world and won a world-empire of its own. Christianity has deepened and ennobled the piety which Israel practised, but it is, after all, Israelite piety which the other nations have accepted.

Only a few remarks will be needed to place before the reader the light in which this book will seek to set the History of the People of Israel.

History has not completed its task when it has related facts and arranged them in their proper order. It must also explain the origin, growth, and decay of nations from the inner necessity of the forces at work in the nations themselves and from their connection with the general objects and aims of the history of the world. There is hardly any field where the attempt to do this meets with a richer reward than in the one that lies before us. Nowhere is the historian more deeply impressed with its propriety and necessity.

In fact, he finds here a series of phenomena which, looked at apart, seem strange and perplexing, and only obtain their full significance and manifest value when regarded as links in the chain which binds human things together. One example will suffice. We usually find a nation displaying its loftiest powers at the time when the community is growing and prospering. A people in its decline can at most gather together all its forces for one supreme, final effort, as the setting sun exhibits all his splendour when the day is dying. But in the case of this most remarkable of all peoples, the overthrow of the nation is the source of its continuance. The observer is confronted with this astonishing sight, that the ruin of the commonwealth and the termination of the national independence issues in a fresh revival

of the national spirit. Nor is it merely as with other nations in their decline, which, amidst the ruins of the past, have clung tenaciously to the memory of bygone splendour and to a passionate regret for their evil fate. That which in other races was destruction was for Israel the occasion of a lasting reformation.

Here again religion is the cause. Religion, the most precious jewel of the Hebrew people! The State has perished. But this is the one race in which the national religion is stronger than the State, thus showing itself to be more than national. The people's life climbs up anew, round the supports furnished by its religion, and produces embodiments of itself that will endure and surpass all preceding ones. Israel henceforward is politically subordinate, and indeed altogether insignificant, yet her ideas conquer the world.

The picture we have drawn is surprising, in fact, startling, till we see it in the light of the object to which the whole tends. Judaism, so called, that is, the later or Jewish phase of the people of Israel, which repels us when compared with that of the Hebrew period, and is a caricature of true and healthy life, full of absurdity and of bad taste, loses its confusedness and meanness when we look at the brilliant goal after which it strives.

In the following history the ruling principle will therefore be the description of events in accordance with the sequence of cause and effect. When a man acts it is because he has a single object in view. But each several event becomes a link in the chain of universal history and there alone finds its true place. So also the single object aimed at by the individual is absorbed in that more universal object, which stands above it and expresses the ultimate idea of the whole process of history. If history does not demonstrate the truth of a teleological view of the world, we, at all events, cannot understand history without carrying the latter idea in our minds. When history deals with the past it is compelled so to study the event as to find out what were the determining causes. And when it looks into the future it must point out the already existing germ of what is hereafter to be. Yet more. Out of the

action and reaction it must educe the law to which all human life is subject and the goal which it seeks. And no less surely must the recognition of the purpose of the whole enrich and deepen the inquirer's comprehension of each several part.

We are far from wishing to construe history according to our own ideas and prepossessions. We would rather study the external course of events in such a way as to learn from the facts the ideas they embody, believing that in every occurrence these are the really essential elements. In this we know ourselves to be of one mind with the great master of historical writing.[1]

§ 2. *Scientific Works on Hebrew History.*

Köhler[2] has given a careful account of the older works on Israelite history from Sulpicius Severus to about the middle of the present century.

The first to produce a comprehensive and grandly designed history of Israel, founded on critical principles, was Heinrich Ewald.[3] Some of his critical assumptions failed from the first to win general acceptance, and others can no longer be maintained. Yet the work of which they are the foundation is the most imposing phenomenon which has thus far been seen in the field of Hebrew history: in many respects it has opened the way and led to further investigation.

Prior to Ewald, Bertheau[4] had brought out a valuable book which is still worthy of attention. Weber and Holtzmann's[5] history is greatly influenced by Ewald in its first part, but shows more independence in the second.

[1] For Ranke's view of history compare not only his own works but also especially C. Rössler, in *Preuss. Jahrb.*, Bd. lviii. p. 64 ff.

[2] *Lehrb. d. bibl. Gesch. d. Alten Bundes*, i. (1875), p. 7 ff. For the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in particular, *cf.* Diestel, *Gesch. d. Alten Testaments*, pp. 460 ff., 577 ff.

[3] *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 1843 ff., 3rd Edition 1864 ff.

[4] *Zur Geschichte der Israeliten. Two Essays.* Gött. 1842.

[5] *Gesch. des Volkes Israel und der Entstehung des Christentums*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1867.

Hitzig's[1] treatment of our subject is in many respects helpful, is rich in fresh combinations, but abounds almost more even than his other writings in arbitrary ideas and baseless hypotheses as well as in acuteness. L. Seinecke[2] has recently surpassed Hitzig, not indeed in learning and philological equipment, but in lack of critical method and historical caution.

Hengstenberg,[3] Hofmann,[4] and Kurtz[5] are amongst the most notable workers on the old traditional lines. The first named of these follows the older school more closely and with less modification than the two latter. A. Köhler[6] has lately taken up a similar position in a work which is remarkable, in each successive part, for its fulness of detail and thoroughness, its learning, depth, and objectivity.

Wellhausen[7] has inaugurated a new epoch in the treatment of Hebrew history. We shall mention elsewhere the writings of Vatke, Graf, and Kuenen which have served as his starting-point. His assumptions and conclusions will also require considerable attention. Excepting in the 'Abriss,' Wellhausen has for the most part confined himself to the criticism of the documents, laying especial stress, however, on the elements supplied by matters of fact. Stade,[8] on the other hand, following in his steps, has just issued the first volume of a real history of Israel. It is characterised by clearness of exposition and many fresh results, as well as

[1] *Gesch. d. V. Israel von Anbeginn bis zur Eroberung Masadas im Jahre* 72 A.D. Lpz., 1869. Two parts.

[2] *Gesch. d. V. Israel*, i. Gött., 1876; ii. Gött., 1884.

[3] *Gesch. des Reiches Gottes unter dem A. Bunde*, Berl., 1869 ff.

[4] *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, Nördl., 1841, 44.

[5] *Gesch. des Alten Bundes*, Berlin, 1848 ff. (3rd Edition, 1864).

[6] *Lehrb. der bibl. Gesch. d. A. Bund.*, Erlg. First Half, 1875; Second Half, First Part, 1-3, 1877-1884; Second Half, Second Part, 1893.

[7] *Gesch. Israels*, vol. i., Berl. 1878; 2nd and 3rd Editions and Title: *Prolegomena zur Gesch. Isr.* 1883 and 1886; *Abriss der Gesch. Israels und Judas in Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 1 Heft, Berl. 1884 (an enlarged translation of the article, 'Israel' in the *Encyc. Brit.*, vol. xiii.). [*Die Comp. des Hexateuchs u. der hist. Bücher d. A. Test.*, Berl., 1889.]

[8] *Gesch. des V. Israel* (in Oncken's Series of Ancient Histories), vol. i. Berl., 1881-1886. [Stade wrote part of vol. ii. (1888), bringing us down to the beginning of the Hellenistic period. From that point to A.D. 70 the story is carried on by O. Holtzmann.]

by great fulness of description and a many-sided treatment of the subject. This first-rate book suffers unmistakably from its author's inadequate sense of the value of tradition. Reuss's[1] work, which is primarily devoted to the Literature, contributes largely to the History also. We have now also a complete work on the subject by Ernest Renan, entitled *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*, (1887-94). It exhibits all Renan's characteristic merits, charming delineation, richness of fancy, plastic power: but not seldom it displays an astonishing lack of historical sensibility. On the whole, the book does not contribute to the advancement of our science to the extent which might have been anticipated from its author's extraordinary learning.

Much help is furnished by the Encyclopædias, especially Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, Riehm's *Handwörterbuch des bibl. Alter-tums*, and, although in a less uniform fashion, the *Realencyclo-pädie für prot. Theologie.*

We have still to mention the books which treat of the entire history of the ancient East. Amongst foreign works the very comprehensive histories of Maspero[2] and Lenormant[3] must be mentioned. The former is, in any case, an Egyptologist rather than an authority on the Old Testament. Hence his book, though containing a multitude of valuable details, loses much of its importance so far as our subject is concerned. Lenormant, too, does not possess a critical acquaintance with Hebrew antiquity. On the other hand, Max Duncker,[4] in Germany, has succeeded in bringing within the framework of a universal history of antiquity a view of Hebrew history derived from careful criticism, and setting in a clear light Israel's relations to other nations. It is indeed true that the critical foundations on which this view rests have now ceased to be tenable. Ed. Meyer[5] has succeeded still

[1] *Gesch. der heil. Schriften des A. Test.*, Braunschw., 1881. Second Edition, 1890.

[2] *Histoire ancienne des peuples d'Orient*, ed. 4, Paris, 1886.

[3] *Histoire ancienne de l'Orient*, etc., ed. 9, 1881 ff.

[4] *Gesch. des Altertums*, i., ed. 5, Leipzig, 1878.

[5] *Gesch. des Altertums*, i., Stuttg., 1884.

better in giving a magnificent survey of the history of the various peoples and their relations to each other. His conclusions are drawn from an independent investigation of almost the whole of the available material. Unfortunately this very excellent work suffers from the same defect as Stade's where Hebrew history is concerned.

§ 3. *Israel's Land and its Products.*

1. *The Land.*[1]—The southern portion of Syria, extending from the foot of Lebanon to the Desert which divides Egypt from Asia, and from the Mediterranean to the Syro-Arabian Desert, is the land which Israel occupied, and regarded as allotted to it by God. Reckoning from the south end of the Dead Sea to the sources of

[1] Special information respecting the extraordinarily abundant literature on this subject is given in Tobler, *Bibliographia geographica Palaestinae*, Lpz. 1867 (to which add Walsborne in the *Serapeum*, 1869, and Tobler, *Bibl. geogr. Pal. ab ann.* 333-1000, Dresd., 1875); Robinson, *Pal.* iii., App. i.; F. W. Schultz in *PRE.*[2] xi. p. 800 ff.; Socin in *ZDPV.*, yearly. In this book we have made special use of Robinson, *Pal.* and *LBR.*, Russegger, *Reisen*; Ritter, *Erdk.* xv. f., and Bädek. In addition to these, particular mention should be made of the following: U. J. Seetzen, *Reisen durch Syrien, etc.*, Berlin, 1854, ff.; J. L. Burckhardt, *Reisen in Syrien und Paläst.*, 1823; V. Schubert, *Reise nach d. Morgenl.* Erl. 1838, ff.; Strauss, *Sinai und Golgotha*, Berlin, 1847; Wolff, *Reise ins gel. Land*, 1849; Van de Velde, *Narr. of a Journey through Syria and Palestine*, 1854; Furrer, *Wanderungen durch Pal.*, 1865; V. Orelli, *durchs h. Land*, 1878; Kiepert, *Alte Geogr.*, 1878, p. 178 ff.; Lortet, *La Syrie d'aujourd'hui*, 1884; Ebers u. Guthe, *Paläst. in Bild und Wort*, 1883 f. (new and cheap edition, 1886 f.). We must also refer to the publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund: *Quarterly Statements, etc.*, 1869 ff.; *Survey of Western Palestine*, 1881, ff.; *Our Work in Pal.*, 1873; *Twenty-one Years' Work in the Holy Land*, 1887. See also the geographical articles in Schenkel's *Bib. Lex.*, Riehm's *HWB.* and *PRE.*[2] The great map of Western Palestine, by Conder and Kitchener, published by the Palestine Exploration Fund, is a very fine piece of cartography. Fisher and Guthe have recently published an excellent Hand Map, *Neue Handkarte von Palaest.*, 1890. [Amongst the more recent English works we may refer to the geographical articles in the second edition of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, revised by Sir C. Wilson, and in a few instances by Major Conder; to Sir C. Wilson's *Picturesque Palestine*, and to the later publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund, such as the *Map of Eastern Palestine*, *The Geology of Palestine and Arabia Petrea*, *Names and Places in the Old Testament and Apocrypha*, *Tent Work in Palestine*, *The City and the Land*. *Cf.* also Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 1894, pp. 1-5.]

the Jordan, it lies between 31° and a little over 33° north latitude. Its breadth is comprised between 34° 20′ and 36° east longitude. Its superficial area is not much more than 520 square miles.

The Hebrews themselves call their territory the Land of Kena'an (Canaan), or, at all events, the country west of the Jordan is so called in the Old Testament. The territory east of the Jordan bears the name of Gilead; its northern half is also called Bashan. Palestine, the usual name at the present day, comes from Pelesheth, the title commonly given by the Hebrews to the Philistine plain beside the sea: from being employed in this limited sense it has been extended to designate the entire country.

The name Kena'an is found on the Egyptian monuments.[1] Its origin and meaning have not yet been determined. Formerly it was the almost universal custom to say that it meant the Lowland, in contrast with Aram, the Highlands. To this it was an obvious objection that the land of Israel is, for the most part, mountainous, and that plains and valleys can only be found in a few districts. It was replied that a designation originally given to the Phoenician settlers on the coast and to their country spread along with the people themselves, so that as they advanced eastwards from the sea to the mountains the name accompanied them until it had embraced the whole western region.[2] That is to say, a process went on in ancient times similar to the one to which we owe the name Palestine. But if the possibility of such a process is granted there is one fact which tells very forcibly against the entire opinion. The sense of Aram as highland in antithesis to Kena'an as lowland is more and more seen to be doubtful.[3] If the true meaning of Aram is the Country of the Exalted, of the Nobles, of the 'Aryans' (bnē shēm), we should be more inclined to see in the Canaanites the Humiliated, the Subdued,[4] and so to

[1] See E. Meyer in *ZA W.*, iii. p. 308, for the statements respecting Rameses III. and Seti I.

[2] By Bertheau, *e.g.*, *Zur Gesch. d. Israel*, p. 153 f.; dubiously by Reuss, *Gesch. d. h. Schr. d. AT.*, p. 43 f.

[3] E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, i. p. 213; Tiele, *Babyl.-Ass. Gesch.*, p. 64.

[4] Cf. the frequent employment in this sense of the Hebrew verbs הכניע and נכנע.

take it as a name given to the conquered race. But if it be proved, as seems almost certain, that the name was known in Egypt at a very early date, it cannot have been invented by the Hebrews as a designation of the Canaanites whom they subdued. Yet one can hardly imagine its having any other origin. For the present we must rest content with a *non liquet*. More recent scholars have maintained in various forms a view which lies midway between the two just mentioned. Abandoning the contrast with Aram, they have seen in Canaan simply the Depression, the hollow by the sea and the Jordan: from these quarters the name is supposed to have been transferred to the hill-country west of the Jordan.[1]

The entire land of Palestine is divided into two halves by a cleft which runs from north to south, and extends beyond the territory of Israel as far as the Arabian Gulf. From the foot of Hermon to the Dead Sea it forms the valley of the Jordan, Israel's most important river. This remarkable ravine begins at the foot of Hermon, at a comparatively small elevation above the Mediterranean. It reaches its lowest point, 394 metres[2] below the sea-level, at the spot where the Jordan enters the Dead Sea. Then it pursues its course to the Arabian Gulf, rising slowly all the way till it reaches a considerable height above the sea.

The distance between the Sea of Gennesaret and the Dead Sea is scarcely fifteen geographical miles. In traversing it the Jordan falls about 200 metres. The fall is much more rapid in the upper stretches. Before reaching the Sea of Huleh it sinks about 437 metres, and between this and the Sea of Galilee about 274. This excessive fall and the consequent swiftness of the stream render the navigation of the Jordan everywhere unsafe. It is true that in the Ghôr, the strip between the Sea of Galilee and the mouth of the Jordan, the river is compelled to wind about to such an extent as to draw out its length to some forty (German) miles.

[1] Dillmann in Schenkel's *Bib.-Lex.*, iii. p. 513 ff.; and *Gen.*[5] p. 179; Kautzsch in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 216; F. W. Schultz in *PRE.*[2] iii. p. 116.

[2] [A metre = 39·37 inches.]

Hence, of course, the stream is somewhat less rapid. But navigation is next to impossible, owing to the cascades and whirlpools. The woods and deserts that surround the stream; the deficiency of fords; the thoroughly tropical heat of the deep hollow, from which the hills on either hand keep off all cooling winds—these, and an abundance of other unfavourable conditions, are adverse to traffic on and around the Jordan.

The Jordan and the Nile have often been compared with each other. Both of them divide their country into two halves. But the Nile is the source of fruitfulness to its country and the most important channel of communication. The Jordan, on the contrary, separates the two halves of its country to such an extent that in many respects they have an independent existence in history.[1]

Amongst the remaining streams of Canaan the tributaries of the Jordan are first to be mentioned. On the west are the Nahr Jalûd and the Wady el-Fâri'a. On the east are the Yarmûk and the Jabbok. The Kidron, in the west, and the Arnon, in the east, flow into the Dead Sea.

The Nahr el Jalûd rises, in all probability, in the neighbourhood of the ancient Jezreel, in two springs which there come to the surface, one of them being the spring of Harôd mentioned in the Book of Judges, or the spring of Jezreel, familiar to us in the history of Saul. Passing along the foot of Mt. Gilboa it flows by Beth Shan into the Jordan. One of the finest[2] streams in the Holy Land is the Wady el-Fâri'a. It has abundance of water and along part of its course gives rise to a luxurious vegetation.[3] Rising not far from Nablûs it flows to Qarn Ṣarṭabeh, the mountain which overhangs the valley of the Jordan. From this point it follows an almost due southerly course, and reaches the Jordan nearly at the 32° north latitude. In the Ghôr its waters diminish considerably. The Yarmûk flows into the other side of the Jordan,

[1] For more information respecting the Jordan, see Robinson, *Pal.* ii. pp. 255-267; iii. 309 ff., 347 ff.; *Phys. Geogr. d. h. Landes*, p. 140 ff.; and especially Lynch, *Narrative of the U.S. Expedition to the River Jordan*, 1849; and Ritter, *Der Jordan und die Beschiffung des T.M.*, Berlin, 1850.

[2] Robinson, *LBR.*, p. 303.

[3] Baedeker², Eng. ed., p. 336.

on the north. The Greeks called it Hieromax. Two hours south of the Sea of Galilee it empties itself into the Jordan at a sharp angle. It rises in the Hauran, and is fed by many copious tributaries, especially from the north, so that it may be reckoned the largest river in Palestine except the Jordan. At its mouth it is as great a stream as the one which it joins.[1] From the rich pasture-land of Gilead flows the splendid Jabbok, now called Nahr ez-Zerka. Its true source, the Nahr 'Ammân, is near the city Rabbath-Ammon, which is so well known in the Old Testament. It flows first to the north-east, then turns west and south-west, and enters the Jordan almost precisely at the 32nd parallel of latitude, a little south of the Wady Fâri'a. When swollen by rain storms the passage is difficult.[2]

The Arnon, now called Wady Môjib, flows into the Dead Sea from the east. As it nears the Dead Sea its valley becomes continually narrower. Steep cliffs approach each other till they form a splendid gorge through which the raging stream cuts its way into the Dead Sea. From the west the Kidron empties itself into the Dead Sea. The valley of the Kidron begins half an hour north-west of Jerusalem and surrounds two sides of the city, the north and the east. Then the ravine runs to the Dead Sea in a south-easterly direction. It is only after a heavy rainfall that the valley is filled with water.[3] The Mediterranean Sea receives only one important stream from the Holy Land, namely, the Kishon, now called el Muqaṭṭa. It flows through the fruitful plain of Megiddo, which also bore in Hebrew the name 'Emeq Jezreel, and now is called Merj ibn Amir. This plain separates Samaria from Galilee, the hill country of Ephraim from that of North Palestine. It was the true battle-field of the Holy Land and has 'drunk the blood of the centuries' from the days of Thothmes III., Deborah and Gideon, Ahab and Pharaoh Necho, to those of the Crusaders and Napoleon I. The Kishon is made up of a

[1] Baedeker, Eng. ed., pp. 338, 398.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 390; Riehm, *HWB.* p. 651; Wellhausen, *Is. u. J. Gesch.*, p. 4, thinks that the Yarmuk, not the Zerka, is to be identified with the Jabbok.

[3] Robinson, *Pal.* i. p. 402; Baedeker, p. 213.

number of little springs and winter torrents that come partly from Gilboa, Tabor and Little Hermon, partly from the hills of Ephraim. It falls into the sea near Mt. Carmel.[1]

Besides these streams, the Holy Land possesses three considerable lakes. They all lie in the line drawn by the Jordan from north to south. Even in its upper course the principal river of Israel is twice interrupted by fairly large basins of fresh water. Both are formed by dikes of volcanic origin, which run across the valley of the Jordan. The first is called by the Arabs, Bahr el Huleh. Modern geographers follow Reland in identifying it conjecturally with the Waters of Merom mentioned in the Book of Joshua. To this marshy expanse of waters they therefore give the name Sea of Merom. It is 83 metres above the sea level. A few hours south of this the Jordan reaches the second fresh-water lake, the Sea of Kinnereth (Kinnarôth), called the Sea of Gennesaret in the New Testament and Josephus. The river enters the lake through a deep ravine, after a course marked by many picturesque waterfalls. The lake is 208 metres[2] below the sea, 21 kilometres[3] long, about 10 broad,[4] and reaches a depth of 50 metres. It abounds in fish, and is navigable. Surrounded on every hand by hills, it usually lies in perfect peace, looking like a blue mirror; but occasionally violent storms arise and lash it into fury.[5]

The Jordan Valley comes to an end in vast beds of rock-salt, heaped together at the southern extremity of the great Depression, and surrounded by lofty perpendicular precipices. Between these lies a broad basin, 73 kilometres long and 17·8 broad, into which the Jordan pours, forming thus a straggling Salt Sea, the Dead Sea. It is entitled to both names. The masses of salt on its southern shore, and the other mineral constituents left behind by the extraordinary evaporation,[6] cause the water to taste extremely

[1] On the Plain of Jezreel, see Ebers-Guthe, i. p. 276 ff.

[2] Baedeker, p. 370, following Lynch: Kiepert, *Alte Geogr.*, p. 173, says 191 metres.

[3] [A kilometre is 1000 metres.]

[4] Varying with the height of the water.

[5] Baedeker, p. 370.

[6] The Jordan is supposed to bring six million tons of water into the Dead Sea daily, and all this is evaporated. Baedeker, p. 268 f.

salt [1] and disagreeably bitter. They also make its specific gravity greater than that of a human body, so that it is impossible for a man to sink. Consequently no living thing can exist in it. There is neither fish nor shell nor coral.[2] Yet it is 'the centre of a landscape of peculiar beauty and manifold charms.'[3] Its surface is now 394 metres below the sea, but at one time it stood 106 metres higher. The extraordinary and long-continued evaporation has gradually diminished the quantity of water. Its greatest depth is 399 metres; in the middle it is 329 metres; in the southern cove it is only about 3 metres.[4]

In addition to the low land of the Jordan and the Plain of Megiddo, the land of Canaan possesses only one important depression, the great stretch of level country which forms the coast of the Mediterranean from Gaza to Caesarea and Dôr. Its southern half is called Shefēlā, its northern Sharôn. The Old Testament,[5] like modern travellers,[6] extols the fertility and beauty of this plain.

All the rest of the country is mountainous. On both sides of the Jordan it is taken up with two great chains of hills, the continuation of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. Speaking broadly, there are limestone hills right from the north to the south, but these are broken into in many places by valleys and ravines. They reach a very fair height—1200 to 1300 metres—in Galilee, a little over 800 or 900 in the other parts of the west, and somewhat over 1000 metres to the east of the Jordan. Although it is evident that the mountains of Israel cannot compare with those of the Lebanon and Hermon, which are as much as 3000 metres high, they are noble hills, especially when viewed from the Jordan Valley far below the sea level. Few of them are solitary peaks.

[1] According to Kiepert, *Alte Geogr.*, p. 174, more than 18 per cent., *i.e.* from five to six times as much as that of the ocean.

[2] O. Fraas, in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 973. [3] Ebers-Guthe, *Paläst.* i. p. 170.

[4] For further particulars respecting the Dead Sea, see O. Fraas, *Das T.M.*, Stuttg. 1867, and the remaining literature in Ebers-Guthe, i. p. 494.

[5] Canticles ii. 1; Isa. xxxiii. 9; xxxv. 2; lxv. 10.

[6] Cf. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. p. 566 ff.; Robinson, *Pal.*, ii. pp. 25, 29, 31; Fraas, *A.d. Orient.*, p. 198.

For the most part they form plateaus, and accordingly are adapted to agriculture up to the very summit, so that even the mountains are, as a rule, arable and fertile.

The two mountain districts of Ephraim and Judah are but slightly separated from each other. One might in fact speak more correctly of two parts of the one mountain district which runs southwards from Carmel and the Kishon Valley. This was the principal theatre of the history of Judah.

The hill-country of Ephraim contains much fertile land and many rich pastures, especially in its northern half. It is only towards the Plain of Sharon,[1] and particularly towards the east, that the mountains are less cultivated. Here the hills are in parts rough and barren, and cleft with wild ravines. But fruitful districts are also to be found. And a series of ruins leads us to the conclusion that this portion of the country may formerly have been more highly cultivated.[2] The mountain range of Judah presents, on the whole, the appearance of a sterile hill-country, scored with ravines more deeply than Mount Ephraim itself.[3] Yet even at the present day its hills and valleys abound in cornfields, oliveyards, and vineyards.[4] Doubtless in ancient times they were even more highly cultivated.

2. *Climate, Flora and Fauna.*—Owing to the remarkable differences of elevation, the climate of Palestine is by no means uniform. There are, however, a certain number of phenomena common to the entire country.[5] And perhaps the more careful cultivation which once prevailed may have caused the climate then to be slightly different from what it is now. Yet, on the whole, we are entitled to believe that the present climate of the Holy Land resembles that of ancient times.

As we should expect from the latitude, the climate is sub-

[1] Robinson, *Later Biblical Researches*, p. 117, etc.
[2] Ritter, *Erdk.* xvi. p. 462 ff.; Robinson, *Later Biblical Researches*, p. 361, etc.
[3] F. W. Schultz in *PRE.*[2] xi. p. 746.
[4] Robinson, *Pal.* ii. pp. 111, 157; Russeger, iii. p. 74 ff.
[5] For further details, see Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 1761 ff.; F. W. Schultz in *PRE.*[2] xi. p. 744 ff.

tropical. On the coast and the high lands it approaches that of the temperate zone. In the deep and sheltered Ghôr it is nearly that of the tropics. Beside the Dead Sea it is thoroughly tropical.

Palestine has but two seasons, summer and winter, *i.e.* the rainless season and the rainy. The so-called 'early rain' falls at the end of October. It derives its name from the fact that it makes the land again fit for cultivation after long drought. The rainy season follows it immediately. November is often mild and bright. December is dull and stormy. But January and February are the true winter months. On the plains they are accompanied with storms and rains; on the hills, not unfrequently, with snow. March and April bring the 'late rain,' which promotes growth and ripens the winter crops. In ancient times the failure of this rain brought the country into danger of famine, and the same consequence, to a great extent, follows still. Summer begins in May. From then to the end of October, clouds and rain are exceptional. The mists too, which for a while continue to be visible in the mountain region, gradually disappear. For months there is a cloudless sky. At night the moon and stars shine with marvellous brilliancy. If the days are hot, the nights are for the most part delightfully cool, and the air is then made fragrant by the refreshing dew. Excepting in the higher districts, wheat is mostly ready for cutting in May: in the low lands barley is often ready in April. In consequence of the higher temperature of the Ghôr everything ripens earlier there than elsewhere.[1]

On the whole, the flora of Palestine is that common to the Mediterranean countries, but it has many things peculiar to itself. From the historical standpoint interest centres chiefly in the list of food-plants and trees.

Corn, oil and wine, the chief products of the Holy Land, obtained at the threshing-floor and the press, are very frequently mentioned together in the Old Testament. We learn from the

[1] Robinson, *Pal.* ii. pp. 99, 100, 262, 263; Ritter, *Erdk.* xv. 1. p. 504 ff.; xvi. p. 134 f.

history of Solomon that the country was capable of feeding itself and exporting considerable quantities of grain and oil.[1] Wheat both was and is the most valuable kind of grain. Barley is looked upon as the food of the poor, but is often enough mentioned. Spelt, millet, rye, maize, beans, lentiles, and a great number of pot-herbs, are extensively grown.[2]

Besides the products of the arable soil we must consider those of the vine and olive, as well as of the fig. When the blessings of the land are proclaimed in the Old Testament, 'vine, olive and fig-tree' are usually named together. The vine grows everywhere, especially in the Lebanon and the hill-country of Judah. Its fruit, whether in the form of grapes or of wine, takes the highest rank as a food and a delicacy.[3] The olive flourishes best on the coast of Phoenicia. The fig-tree bears fruit almost all through the year. Figs are highly esteemed, both when fresh gathered and when dried and pressed. Sycomore figs and pomegranates, apples and pears, almonds, peaches, apricots, oranges and other fruits are also grown, though not so extensively as the vine, the olive, and the fig. Save in exceptional instances the date-palm brings its fruit to maturity only at Jericho, 'the city of palm-trees,' and a few other places.

In addition to the fruit-trees every reader of the Old Testament is familiar with the noblest tree of Palestine, the cedar of Lebanon, which at one time covered the ridges and slopes of that range, but is now becoming extinct. Oaks, terebinths, tamarisks, and cypresses are also as much at home in the Old Testament as in the Palestine of to-day.

Sheep and oxen are the domestic animals most frequently mentioned in the Old Testament. The rearing of sheep flourishes now all over the country as much as formerly, but oxen appear to be far less common and the breed to have degenerated.

[1] 1 Kings v. 11.

[2] See Rütschi's article 'Ernte' in *PRE.*[2] and Riehm's 'Ackerbau' in *HWB.*

[3] *Cf.* V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere in ihr. Übergange a. Asien*, etc. (²1874), p. 62 ff.; also the articles on 'Wein' in the *Realwörterb.*

Goats and asses are greatly prized, the former for their milk, the latter for riding and as beasts of burden. The horse did not obtain a footing in Israel until the period of the Kings;[1] now it is much used in Palestine. When first introduced it seems to have been a costly possession, within reach only of the king and the nobles. The Israelites were quite familiar with the camel, but it is more used by the Bedouins of the desert than by the settled population.

The wandering dog, without a master, common throughout the East; and the cat, seldom domesticated in the Holy Land, may be counted amongst the wild animals. At the head of this class stands the lion, which is frequently mentioned in the poetry and the prose of Israel. He has now disappeared from Palestine but seems to have been pretty frequently met with in ancient times, especially in the thickets of the Jordan valley and in the Lebanon. Wolves and bears are still found in the Lebanon. Hyænas and jackals are common in all parts of the country. In ancient times northern Syria was acquainted with the elephant (Meyer, *Gesch. Aegypt.*, p. 241).

§ 4. *The Inhabitants and Neighbours of Canaan.*[2]

1. *The Inhabitants.*—The people who settled in Canaan after the time of Moses, to whose history this book is devoted, called themselves Sons of Israel. In the historical period this name was for a long time specially applied to the northern tribes, and it would seem probable that it belonged originally to a single leading tribe.[3] Owing to its importance this tribe would be able to impose its own name, first on the northern group and subsequently on the entire people. Many other tribal names have gone through a similar process, becoming ultimately the names of nations.

The patriarchal history states further that Israel is a later

[1] On this, see Hehn, *Kulturpfl. und Haust.*, p. 20 ff.; Riehm in *HWB.*, p. 1179 ff.

[2] *Cf.* Wellh., *Isr. u. J. Gesch.*, pp. 5-9.

[3] Stade, *Gesch. Isr.*, i. p. 124 ff.

name for the founder of the tribe, and that originally he was called Jacob. From this it may be concluded that there was at one time a tribe called Jacob which afterwards blended with and took the name of the tribe of Israel to which it was related. In point of fact Ed. Meyer believes that he has found the name Jacob in the list of Palestinian populations conquered by Thothmes III.[1] It thus becomes increasingly probable that Israel was once the name of a tribe. According to Meyer the name Israel must have specially attached itself to the east of the Jordan and to the mountain district of Ephraim, and the name Jacob to south Palestine. These and other tribes must subsequently[2] have coalesced in the one tribe of Israel: the original owner of the name then disappeared entirely; other tribes, such as Joseph, whose name Meyer believes he has also found in the list of Thothmes III., kept their places as subordinate tribes to Israel-Jacob right up to the historical period.

It may no doubt be surprising that the tribe which, as being the most important, gave its name to the rest of those out of which at a later day the nation was formed, should disappear entirely. Yet it is scarcely possible to explain in any other way the fact that the people of the Holy Land bore the name Israel. Here we obtain a little insight into the origin of the twelve tribes. Jacob and Joseph, and many other clans, at one time formed separate clans, but afterwards became unable to maintain the position of independent tribes. Community of blood, of interests and of country had already brought them into more or less intimate relations. As time passed on they came closer together and gradually began to constitute a united people.[3]

Foreigners called Israel by the name 'Ibrim, Hebrews. The same title is used when they are contrasted with foreigners. The word means people from the other side, and doubtless points to

[1] In the form יעקבאר (ל=ר). See *ZA W.* vi. (1886), p. 1 ff.

[2] But not at so late a date as the times of Saul and David, as Meyer thinks. The names found in the pre-Egyptian period indicate that it was during that period the confusion of tribes took place. *Cf.* the Song of Deborah.

[3] Following the lead of Ewald, Stade has dealt thoroughly with the history of the origin of the several tribes, especially in *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 145 ff.

the immigration of these tribes into a district which they had not previously owned. This title used to be deemed a reminiscence of the migration of the Hebrew tribes from Mesopotamia and their crossing the Euphrates. Now, however, the prevalent view is that the Israelites were called Hebrews from their having come across the Jordan.[1]

Such investigations as we are able to make into the history of the language of Israel lead to the conclusion that it was that branch of the great Semitic family of languages[2] which is briefly named Hebrew. With the exception of a few minor dialectal differences, such as occur even in Israel itself—both in the north and in the south—Israel spoke the same Hebrew tongue as the Canaanite-Phoenician population which held the land previously, and the related peoples which came in at the same time or earlier or later. It is true there are a few questions that cannot be definitely answered. Did Israel adopt the language of the Canaanite 'aborigines,'[3] in which case the language should be called rather Canaanite or Phoenician?[4] Or was it the Canaanites who at some time in the remote past exchanged their mother-tongue for a language so closely related to the Hebrew?[5] Or had Israel and Canaan the same speech from the first,[6] and were they thus more closely connected in race and language than tradition seems to imply? These are points which cannot be finally decided.[7] At any rate the question, so far as it is ripe for decision, is very closely connected with that which we have now to touch upon, viz., the origin of the Canaanites.

It is certain that before the Israelites forced their way into the

[1] Redslob, *Altt. Namen*, p. 13; Stade, *Hebr. Gram.*, i. p. 1; *Gesch. Isr.*, i. p. 110; Meyer, *ZAW*, i. p. 142; Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 52.

[2] See Hommel, *Die Semit. Volk. und Sprach.*, 1881; Stade, *Hebr. Gram.*, i. p. 2 ff.; Nöldeke, *Die Semit. Sprachen*, 1887, especially p. 1 ff., 17 ff.

[3] Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 53, and many others.

[4] *Cf.* Isa. xix. 18, 'Language of Canaan.'

[5] Kautzsch in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 1201.

[6] Smend in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 1526.

[7] For another possible answer, nearly related to the second of the above-named, see Bertheau's *Hebr. Sprache* in *PRE.*[2] v. p. 687.

country the Canaanites dwelt there. We have already (§ 1) discussed the meaning of their name. At a later time the name Canaanite, in its more restricted sense, was given to the Phoenicians settled on the northern half of the Mediterranean coast, the remnant of the original population who had been driven back into that district. The name as thus applied may be taken to mean simply 'Phoenician trader.'[1] The origin of the race remains uncertain. Some[2] follow the Old Testament, which calls Canaan a son of Ham:[3] to them the Canaanites are a Hamitic people from the south. Others think themselves entitled confidently to maintain the Semitic origin of this people because of its Semitic speech.[4] It would be difficult to prove the second of these theories conclusively, and that for two reasons: in the first place, the possibility of a change of language cannot be peremptorily set aside; and secondly, the statements of the Old Testament cannot be shown to proceed from racial animosity,[5] seeing that the Babylonians also, but not the Assyrians, are traced to Ham in the Table of Nations (Gen. x.). On the side of the Old Testament, also, is the testimony of the ancients.[6]

It is only J amongst the authors of the Hexateuch, and the writers who more or less followed him, that use the name Canaanite with reference to the entire pre-Israelite population. E usually, if not always, calls that ancient people Amorites.[7] This designation, like that of Canaanite, is proved by Egyptian

[1] Isa. xxiii. 8; Ezek. xvii. 4; Hosea xii. 8; Zeph. i. 11; Zech. xiv. 21; Prov. xxxi. 24; Job xl. 30.

[2] Bertheau, *Zur Gesch.*, p. 163 ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] i. p. 343, (Eng. Trans., i. p. 232); Hitzig, *Gesch. Isr.*, p. 26 f.; Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 179; Kautzsch in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 1200 f.

[3] Gen. x. 6, 15 f.; *cf.* ix. 20 ff.

[4] Movers, *Phönicier*, i. p. 1 ff.; Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 43; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, i. p. 214 f.

[5] Sprenger, *Geogr. Arab.*, p. 294 f.; Tuch, *Genesis*, p. 196 f.

[6] On this see especially Bertheau *ut supra*, p. 163 ff.

[7] Wellhausen, *JDTh.*, xxi. p. 602. Steinthal, *Zeitschr. f. Völkerspsych. und Sprachwiss*, xii. p. 267. And especially Ed. Meyer, *ZAW.*, i. p. 122 ff. Whether E employs the name exclusively or only predominantly depends on the decision as to single passages, such as Judges i. 34 f.

evidences to have been a very ancient name of races dwelling in Palestine, current as early as the sixteenth century B.C.[1]

Besides the two principal names, which evidently represent the two[2] most important ethnic elements in the pre-Israelitish population, we find, especially among later writers, references to a number of subordinate Canaanite tribes: Girgashites, Perizzites (Pheresites), Hivvites, Jebusites, and Hittites.

Some of these names belong to special localities. The Jebusites, for example, were the inhabitants of Jebus and its vicinity, and the Hivvites were the population of Gibeon and Shechem. The significance of others cannot now be satisfactorily determined. It is disputed whether the name Hittites has been transferred[3] from the well-known civilised nation of that name in the north of Palestine, or whether it belongs properly to a smaller tribe in Palestine, a severed branch perhaps of the greater people. The latter opinion is probably true. Of late there have not been wanting those who maintain that all these smaller tribes have been interpolated into the narratives by the Deuteronomistic redactor. This view has been just as strenuously opposed.[4] The question cannot be settled until the various sources of the Hexateuch have been carefully and definitely distinguished from each other. And this task has not yet been accomplished. For my part, at all events, I must confess that my mind is not made up.[5]

The Old Testament itself shows that the Canaanites were not aborigines, for it gives expression to a faint remembrance of the predecessors whom they drove out. That these latter are

[1] Meyer, *ZA W.*, i. p. 127; iii. p. 306 ff.; *Gesch. d. Altert.*, i. p. 213 f.

[2] I am still unable to assert that both names have precisely the same signification. The double name is an argument against this, as is also the use of two names, Kanāna and Amār, on the Egyptian monuments.

[3] The view especially of Meyer, *ZA W.*, i. p. 125; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.*, i. p. 143; Budde, *Urgesch.*, p. 347 f. Dillmann opposes it, *Gen.*[5] p. 190.

[4] *Cf.* Wellh., xxi. p. 403 f.; Meyer, *ZA W.*, i. p. 124 ff.; Budde, *Urgesch.*, p. 222. On the other side, Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 189; *NuDtJo.*, p. 272.

[5] It is certain that in many passages they are interpolated: the question is whether this applies to all. But even if it does, the names cannot be baseless inventions. Their insertion is due to the necessity felt by later writers of entering more into detail.

called giants (Rephaim, Anakim) is no good reason for relegating them to the domain of fiction. The districts around Israel, which in later times were occupied by the tribes we are next to deal with, were believed to have been previously held by men of similar gigantic stature whose race and extraction are no longer clear. In Moab and Ammon were the Zamzummim and the Emim; in Edom and Philistia, the Horites and 'Avvites.

2. *Israel's Neighbours.*—The Sons of Moab, Ammon and Edom, are looked upon as the most closely related neighbouring peoples, and consequently are classed with Israel amongst the Hebrew tribes in the wider sense of the term. Edom is considered a brother tribe in the full sense of the word, the progeny of Jacob's brother Esau. Edom is the elder of the two. He became independent sooner than his brother. But the latter took away his birthright, *i.e.* outstripped him. Accordingly we learn that long before Saul's time there was a kingdom in Edom.[1] After the reigns of Saul and David Edom became more and more dependent on Israel.[2] As to their nationality, the Edomites introduced many foreign elements into their original Hebrew blood. The aboriginal Horite[3] inhabitants of the districts owned by Edom appear to have gradually blended with the conquerors, but to have been a long time before they lost their special characteristics.[4] The Edomites also took into union with themselves some of the tribes of the Arabian desert, especially when they pushed towards the south. In the south of Judah, the northern part of their territory, they allied themselves with Canaanites. In addition to a Horite woman, Esau marries an Ishmaelite and a Hittite.[5] The domain of Edom is that wild and broken mountain-land of Seir, which seems to recommend to its possessors the pursuits of plunder and

[1] Gen. xxxvi. 31 ff.; Num. xx. 21; Judges xi. 17.

[2] 1 Sam. xiv. 47; Ps. lx. 2: 1 Chron. xix. 12; 2 Sam. viii. 13 ff. (for ארם read אדם).

[3] = Troglodytes. On the abundance of caves in the land of Edom, see Robinson, *Pal.*, ii. p. 424. On the Horites, see also Meyer, *Gesch. Aeg.*, p. 227, *Anm.* 3.

[4] See Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 375; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.*, i. p. 122.

[5] Gen. xxvi. 34; xxviii. 9; xxxvi. 2; on the last passage see especially Dillm. *Gen.*[5]

the chase rather than agriculture and cattle-breeding. The Old Testament uses this name of the mountainous country between the Dead Sea and the Elanitic Gulf. But whilst the earlier documents speak of the Arabah,[1] the strip of land which runs from the Dead Sea to the Red Sea, as the eastern boundary, later authorities[2] include the district to the east of this. The chief towns of Edom known to us, such as Elath, Ezion-Geber, Sela, etc., were situated in this eastern half. From the western half, and from the north of Judah, the Edomites were ultimately expelled.

Israel's south-eastern neighbour, Moab, was another closely related tribe, connected with it in many ways. Its territory was bounded on the west by the Dead Sea, on the south, towards Edom, by the Arabah (Nachal ha 'Arabah): on the east by the desert and by the land of Ammon, which touched its north-eastern frontier. In later times, subsequent to Mesha, the Arnon was its northern boundary. More anciently the Moabites, no doubt, extended much farther north, as far as the district of Jericho. We shall have to speak again about the northern boundary of Moab in the days of Moses. This mountain-land is well watered by numerous streams, and there are many indications of its having been well cultivated formerly. In speech, civilisation and religion, its inhabitants seem to have closely resembled the Israelites. The inscription of Mesha affords evidence of a comparatively developed taste for literature and composition.

The brother-tribe of Moab which lived to the north-east was Ammon. Its territory lay between the desert and the southern portion of the country inhabited by Reuben, Gad and Manasseh, eastward of the Jordan. Ordinarily it would seem to have extended from the Upper Jabbok as its north-westerly limit[3] to the Arnon in the south. But the Ammonites often attempted to enlarge their borders. Their chief successes in these attempts seem to have been won towards the north. The very position of Rabbath-Ammon, their capital, on the Jabbok itself, as well as

[1] Judges v. 4; Deut. xxxiii. 2; Gen. xiv. 6.
[2] Deut. ii. 1 ff.; Ezek. xxv. 8; xxxv. 15.
[3] Deut. iii. 16.

their later struggles for the possession of Gilead, makes this probable.

On the south-west Israel came into contact with the warlike race of the Philistines (Heb. Pelishtîm), who were frequently in antagonism with their neighbours. They held the southern half of the Mediterranean coast-land, from Gaza to Japho, *i.e.* from the Egyptian to the Phoenician border. Along this line they prevented the Israelites from obtaining access to the sea. They had a number of strong cities, governed by independent princes: Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, Ekron. From these points they partially succeeded in pushing their way far into Canaan Proper. The usually accepted etymology of their name is sufficient to show that they were not indigenous to Canaan. The Old Testament[1] speaks of them as immigrants from Caphtor, which in all probability is not the Egyptian Delta,[2] but the island of Crete.[3] There can be no doubt that in the later stages of their history they present a purely Semitic appearance. We may go even further and assert that the most probable view of all is that they were true Semites but belonged to a branch of the race which contained many foreign elements, many traits and peculiarities, in fact, of Pelasgic origin.[4]

The Phoenicians are in line with the Philistines on the north. As we have explained above, they were the remnant of the Canaanites which had retired to the coast. They appear to have not only exercised considerable influence on the material civilisation of Northern Israel through their wealth and commercial supremacy, but also to have largely determined the form of the

[1] Amos ix. 7; Deut. ii. 23. On Gen. x. 13 f., see Dillm. *Gen.*[5]

[2] Ebers, *Aeg. und BB. Mos.*, p. 127 ff.; Stark, *Gaza*, p. 76 f.; Dietrich in Merx, *Archiv.*, i. p. 313 ff.; Köhler, *Gesch.* i. p. 83.

[3] Bertheau, *Zur. Gesch.*, p. 187 ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] i. p. 353 f. (Eng. Trans., i. p. 245); Hitzig, *Philist.*, p. 16 f.; Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 189; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.*, i. p. 142. As to the conjectural date of the immigration, *cf.* Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, i. p. 319 f.

[4] See Schrader, *KAT.*[2] p. 167 (Eng. Trans., p. 155),; Baur, in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 1198; Stade, *Gesch.*, i. p. 142. Another view in Hitzig, *Urgesch. d. Philist.*; also Kneucker in Schenkel's *Bib.-Lex.*, iv. p. 541 ff.; further in Köhler, *Gesch.*, i. p. 83.

intellectual culture of the Israelitish people. Among themselves, as well as among the Hebrews and Greeks, they were designated Sidonians, from Sidon, their ancient 'Fishertown,' the original centre of their magnificent naval commerce.

The Arameans and Hittites[1] were Israel's northern inland neighbours. To both these peoples the Assyrians gave the same name.[2] But their identity is in the highest degree doubtful, seeing that the Arameans were Semites, whereas it is most probable that the Hittites were not originally a Semitic race. The Hittites were the older of the two peoples. Their seat was in Coele-Syria and on the Orontes: Kadesh, on the Orontes, being their capital. With this as their starting-point, they founded a powerful empire,[3] which ruled over the district from Asia Minor to the Euphrates, during the period of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth Egyptian dynasties, but afterwards yielded to the conquests of Egypt and Assyria. The Old Testament also is aware of their presence in Syria.[4] Although largely Semitised, they can hardly have been originally Semites.[5] The Hittites of Palestine, mentioned in the Old Testament, were probably a small branch of this race which had found its way to the south.

Beside them, and in place of them, after the decline of their power, the Arameans (subsequently called Syrians) established themselves more and more strongly in the north and north-east of Palestine. They were a Semitic race, probably from the Armenian Highlands and the Euphrates, closely related to the Hebrews in customs and in speech. Their most important settlements were at Damascus, on the lower Orontes, and farther in the eastern plain up to the neighbourhood of the Euphrates, where they were divided into several independent kingdoms.

[1] On the Hittites see many passages in Meyer's *Gesch. Aegypt.*; also Hommel's *Babyl.-Ass. Gesch.*, p. 419. [2] Schrader, in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 79.
[3] Amongst others, see Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, i. pp. 213, 218, 276 ff.
[4] 1 Kings x. 29; 2 Kings vii. 9. [5] Meyer, *ut supra*, p. 213.

BOOK I

THE PERIOD ENDING WITH THE CONQUEST OF CANAAN.

A. SOURCES OF INFORMATION RESPECTING THIS PERIOD.

I. THE OLD TESTAMENT HEXATEUCH.

§ 5. *Tradition and its Authority.*

Amongst both Jews[1] and Christians[2] it is a tradition of old standing that the History and Law Book, comprised under the name of 'The Five Books of Moses,'[3] came from the pen of Moses himself. The only question was as to who wrote, and appended to the rest, the last verses of the fifth book which treat of the death of Moses himself, and therefore can hardly have been the legislator's own composition. In like manner the Book of Joshua was believed to have been written by its hero. The Book of Joshua and the Pentateuch are so closely related, that, as we shall see from the ensuing investigation, it will be convenient for our purpose to speak of these together under the collective name of Hexateuch, now so commonly used. Further on we shall have to show that there are limits to the relationship between them. It is true that even in bygone centuries[4] a few isolated and timid attempts were made to cast doubt on this tradition, but on the whole it continued to be the prevalent opinion till not very long

[1] Philo. Josephus. Talmud Baba bathra 14b. Later Jews.

[2] From the Fathers to modern expositors.

[3] The name, however, is not original, but comes in this form from Rufinus and Jerome. See Bleek,[4] p. 9.

[4] See § 6.

ago. Considering the fundamental importance of the Hexateuch for the interpretation of the history of ancient Israel as a whole, it is the first duty of the historian to define the position he adopts with reference to that interpretation as to the character of the great Hexateuchal work and the method of its composition. This cannot be done by giving a brief summary of the results of assured investigation, as is the case where these are to be found in many other sources of Hebrew history. For although the historian can with a good conscience take a firm stand on many recognised results, he meets, as every one acquainted with the subject knows, many unsolved questions and new-found problems in the study of the Hexateuch. If the presentation of Hebrew history is really to bear the character of a trustworthy narrative concerning the past of the most remarkable of all peoples, there can be no escape, at least for the present, from the work of testing the hypotheses brought forward concerning the Hexateuch and of taking some position with regard to them founded on detailed observation. The work is troublesome and is repaid only by its intrinsic value. The future may render unnecessary this method of facilitating the writing of Hebrew history, which has so little charm for either reader or author; but the present time and the present condition of our knowledge seem to demand it.

The assertion that Moses composed the Pentateuch cannot be proved. Along with it the belief that the Book of Joshua was written by its hero falls to the ground. The testimony of the Hexateuch itself, as well as that of other Scriptures, has indeed been appealed to in support of these theses. But the only question that can come into serious consideration is that of the testimony borne by the Hexateuch. All other data admittedly belong to periods so distant from that of Moses that they cannot be adduced as evidence.

To a superficial observation some passages of the Pentateuch appear to assert that Moses wrote the whole, but a more searching inquiry immediately dissipates the idea. These passages never

speak of anything beyond individual sections of the whole. They attribute special importance to the fact that Moses wrote them. This is the case with the Defeat of the Amalekites, the Book of the Covenant, the List of Encampments (Ex. xvii. 14; xxiv. 4, 7; xxxiv. 27: Num. xxxiii. 2), and the central part of Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomic legislation proper (Deut. v.-xxvi.).[1] It was undoubtedly owing to this last passage that after the fifth book had been joined to the other four to form one work, the belief grew up that the editing of all five books should be attributed to Moses. But this idea is certainly not established by the explicit statements of the Pentateuch. The same applies to a passage in the Book of Joshua,[2] which seems to state that he wrote the book. It refers to chapter xxiv. only, or, at most, to that and chapter xxiii. The entire book, as we now possess it, was never counted as part of the 'Law Book,' but always sharply separated from it. As to the rest, the very expressions in the Hexateuch which emphasise the fact that the sections to which they belong were written by Moses and Joshua, show plainly enough that the narrators knew very well how to distinguish their own contributions from the little that they refer back to Moses himself, and wished the distinction to be known.[3]

But the indirect evidence which may be drawn from the contents of the Hexateuch is of much more importance. These contents consist of Law and History. Each of these divisions must needs afford support either to the theory which asserts or to that which denies the Mosaic origin of the books in question.[4]

The legal part of the Hexateuch puts it beyond doubt that the laws were neither written by one author nor at one and the

[1] Deut. xxxi. 9 ff., 24 f.: *cf.* xxviii. 58, 61; xxix. 19, 20, 26; xxx. 10.

[2] Josh. xxiv. 26. Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] p. 17, gives a somewhat different explanation. Such passages as Josh. i. 8; viii. 31, 34; xxiii. 6 say nothing about the author of this work. Their Deuteronomic origin (see below) and their similarity with the analogous passages in Deuteronomy (Deut. xxviii. 58, etc.: see the preceding note), show that they refer to Deuteronomy.

[3] See Reuss, *Gesch. d. hl. Schriften d. AT.*, p. 232.

[4] *Cf.* Reuss, *L'histoire sainte et la loi*, 1879, p. 39 ff.; *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 84 ff.; Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] §§ 3 and 4; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 593 ff.

same time. This alone makes it clear that the great body of the Hexateuchal laws cannot have been edited by Moses or have originated in his time.

The laws which in the Hexateuch are so joined together as to apparently form a unity fall immediately, on a more exact investigation, into a larger number of groups, of which each has its peculiar terminology and characteristic mode of presentation. The reader finds clearly fixed modes of speech which show signs of being settled formulae used by one author, whereas in another they seldom or never occur. Similar ordinances can thus be set forth in different ways. But one and the same author does not write thus. To this class belong especially the well-known formulae characteristic of the Priest's Code P,[1] the Law of Holiness H,[2] and Deuteronomy[3] respectively, which appear to every reader almost at the first glance as the clear signs of these books.[4]

This diversity of language is almost surpassed by the differences amongst the commands themselves, and the historical assumptions from which the laws proceed. The directions given in the several groups of laws respecting sacrifices, festivals, the places for divine worship, the priests and Levites, the sacred tributes, and the dwelling-places of Levites and priests, vary from each other so widely that it is utterly impossible to speak of a unity of the whole law-giving so far as time and editor are concerned. The Book of the Covenant is acquainted with three annual feasts, at which a pilgrimage should be made to Yahvé's sanctuary: Leviticus and Numbers mention seven feasts.[5] In the former case the festivals are mainly of an agricultural character: in the latter, religious and ceremonial. The Passover wears a quite

[1] *e.g.* 'Aaron and his sons'=priests; 'that soul shall be cut off (נכרתה) from among his people;' 'the whole congregation (קהל and עדה) of the sons of Israel;' and many others.

[2] *e.g.* 'I am Yahvé,' or 'I am Yahvé your God.'

[3] *e.g.* 'The priests the Levites' etc.=priests; 'Ye shall destroy the wicked man from the midst of you (בער);' and many similar expressions.

[4] On this, see further Knobel, *NuDtJo.*, pp. 515 ff., 527 ff., 587 ff., and Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] pp. 88 f., 109 ff., 115, 119 f., 131, 281 ff.

[5] *Cf.* Ex. xxiii. and Lev. xxiii.; Num. xxviii. f.

different aspect in Deuteronomy from what it has in Exodus.[1] The Book of the Covenant permits altars to be built and sacrifices offered to Yahvé in various localities: Deuteronomy abrogates this ordinance in the most decisive fashion and requires that Yahvé shall be worshipped only at the one place which He has chosen that service may be offered to His name there.[2] The legislation of Leviticus and Numbers knows no priests save Aaron and his sons, whereas the other members of the tribe of Levi have to content themselves with the subordinate position of mere assistants to the priests. In Deuteronomy the sons of Levi are designated the priests.[3] Although, as will later be manifest, this difference between the two classes of legal documents is not so thoroughgoing as is frequently represented, yet in any case it is sufficiently extensive to exclude absolutely the possibility of the same writer having drawn up both groups of precepts. In like manner the laws concerning the payment of tithes, the first-born, the cities of the priests,[4] and many other matters, differ among themselves.

If, however, we should attempt to reconcile this diversity of contents with unity of authorship by appealing to the fact that the legislation went on for forty years, and thus explain all differences as due to later changes of the original legislation, made by Moses himself, this way out of the difficulty would soon show itself a thoroughly unsatisfactory shift. The differences are so numerous and great that if made by the same legislator they would have given to his work the appearance of great irresolution and arbitrary experimentalising. They can be explained satisfactorily only as products of different ages and of the attempts to legislate that were at work during those ages, changing according to the needs and circumstances of the times.

To this must be added that in the laws of the Hexateuch the people addressed are everywhere assumed to be occupied in agri-

[1] *Cf.* Deut. xvi. and Ex. xii.

[2] *Cf.* Ex. xx. 24, and Deut. xii. 1 ff.; xiv. 23 ff.; xvi. 2, 6 f., etc.

[3] *Cf.* Ex. xxviii. f., Num. iii. f.; viii., xviii., etc. with Deut. x. 8 f.; xvii. 9, 18; xviii. 1; xxi. 5, etc.

[4] On this see, for example, Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 3, notes 17-19.

culture and town-life; and nowhere, except in Deuteronomy, is there any reference to the transition from the nomadic to the settled state. Nor can there be found, except in Deuteronomy, the assumption that the laws which are here promulgated will become binding in the future only. The commentary on the Decalogue implies the existence of servants, handmaids, cattle, and strangers in the cities of Israel. The Book of the Covenant knows slavery in a form which could not conceivably exist among nomads. When it mentions vineyards and corn, olives and figs, oxen and asses, and especially strangers and sojourners, it is in a tone which implies that these do not belong simply to the future but will be understood at once, without explanation, by the people whom the lawgiver addresses.[1] Thus also Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writing, the former consciously, the latter more implicitly, are well acquainted with the Wandering in the Desert, but in a way which at the same time arouses the suspicion as to whether the lawgiver does not know the life in Canaan very well from personal experience. Such institutions as the sacrificial office and the festivals, or the presentation of the first-born and the tithes, could not be carried into effect except in the land, yet are depicted with a minuteness of detail and with such a thorough acquaintance with the actual practice that it seems hardly feasible to any one who did not himself live in the land and know the religious life of the people.[2]

And finally, if the regulations on legal relations given in the Hexateuch had been imposed on a nation which was not yet familiar with the life of the country, an explanation would have been required of the way and manner in which they were to be carried out, almost fuller than that required by those concerning worship and everyday life. If such explanations are not afforded, this is a clear indication that the reader could ascertain by experience all that he needed to know; in other words, that the laws were meant for a people already possessed of a settled con-

[1] Ex. xx. 10; xxi. 1 ff.; xxii. 4 f., 28; xxiii. 4 f., 10-12, 16, 19.

[2] On this point *cf.* Lev. xiv. 40 f., 45, 53; xix. 9 f., 19; xxv.; xxvii. 16 ff.; Deut. xx. 5 f.; xxi. 3; xxii. 8; xxiii. 25.

stitution, for Israel in Canaan.[1] Moreover, it has been correctly pointed out[2] that the precepts, scanty on the whole, concerning the domestic politics and the public law of Israel are so limited in number and detail that this is an evidence against their Mosaic origin. For one of the primary needs of a people that is passing from a nomadic into a settled state is legal regulation of its civic life. If this is largely lacking, it is a token that when the laws were given Israel already possessed regulations and rules of civic life. Add to this what has already been made clear, viz., that many precepts are repeated, some of them more than once, some in forms that vary considerably. From all these considerations it will be seen that the verdict which refuses to credit Moses with the laws of the Hexateuch as a whole can hardly meet with a serious contradiction.

A somewhat closer inquiry into the historical portions of the Hexateuch leads to the same results.

Here also one of the first impressions made on us is that the whole narrative-material in the Hexateuch falls into a series of strata, all the members of which are closely connected with one another in language, style, and characteristic phraseology, but is most markedly unlike the others even where the narratives are similar or related in contents. The close connection between the narratives and the laws would, of itself, have prepared us for this discovery. Examples of this occur continually in the historical material of the Hexateuch. Reading quite superficially the accounts which the original text gives of the Creation of the world and of the People of Israel we are confronted with these examples at every turn without our looking for them. To convince one's-self of the truth of this it is only needful to look at the two accounts of the Creation, the various constituents of the story of the Flood, the histories of the calling of Moses, of the Plagues of Egypt, of the Passage of the Red Sea, of the Giving of the Law on Sinai,[3] and many others.

[1] *Cf.* Ex. xxi. 6; xxii. 7 f.; Deut. xvii. 8-13; and on these Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 25.
[2] See, for example, Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 595.
[3] Gen. i. f., vi. f.; Ex. iii. and vi., xiv., xix f.

As might have been expected it also appears in this connection that the narratives contain many differences and repetitions. We have two or more accounts of a great number of the Hexateuch narratives. Thus, besides the events already mentioned, we may instance the accounts of the Dispersion of the Nations, the origin of certain names and sanctuaries, the particulars of the history of Joseph, the publication of the name Yahvé, the apostasy which followed the giving of the Law, the quails and the manna, the spies, the faction of Korah, the history of Balaam, the appointment of Joshua.[1] Examples of this kind could easily be multiplied to any extent. As a last resort it might be said of a number of these repetitions that they are due to the writer's own purpose. Such an explanation would, at least, be admissible were it not that in almost every case the repetition of the statement of facts is closely accompanied by the above-mentioned dissimilarity of language. This makes it extremely unlikely that the repetition can be explained as an addition from the hand of the one author or a resumption by him of the previously dropped thread of the narrative. The improbability becomes an impossibility when we observe that in almost every case the two or more narratives of the same event disagree materially in a number of traits of more or less importance. The second of the above-mentioned accounts of the Creation knows nothing about six days and recognises a quite different order in the creative acts,[2]—the result of a different historical point of view. As to the Deluge, we are told on the one hand that seven couples of clean animals went into the ark,[3] and on the other hand that one couple of every sort entered. The names Beersheba, Bethel, Israel are explained in ways so entirely different that one and the same author cannot be credited with them all. Joseph is in one account said to have been cast into a pit at Reuben's suggestion and to have

[1] Gen. x. and xi. 1 ff.; xxi. 31 and xxvi. 33; xxxii. 29 and xxxv. 10; xxviii. 18 f. and xxxv. 14 f.; xxxvii. 19 ff.; xxxix. 1 ff.; Ex. iii. and vi. xxxii.; Num. xi. and Ex. xvi.; Num. xiii. f., xvi., xxii.-xxiv. and xxv.; xxvii. 15 ff. and Deut. xxxi. 7 ff.

[2] Man—Trees and Vegetables—Animals—Woman: Gen. ii. 7 ff., 19, 21 f.

[3] *Cf.* Gen. vii. 2 f. and vi. 19 f.; vii. 8 f., 14 f.

been stolen by Midianites; again, we learn that by Judah's advice he was sold to Ishmaelites.[1] The father-in-law of Moses is sometimes called Jethro, sometimes Reuel.[2] In the leading narrative the Tabernacle is located in the midst of the camp: close by, it stands outside the camp.[3]

This small selection of examples may suffice, as the reader in the further course of this book will be able to compare separately the various strata of the Hexateuch narratives, and by so doing to increase the material which is here brought together in anticipation. But the specimens we have given place it beyond doubt that the phenomena already adduced, in themselves, and, above all, in their mutual connections, can be satisfactorily explained only by admitting that the narratives of the Hexateuch, like its laws, proceeded not from one but from a series of authors. All these differences in speech and style, in contents and ideas, can only be regarded as proofs of the presence of various groups and strata of narratives into which the story of the Hexateuch may be resolved. Before we are competent to decide as to the historical validity of their statements we shall need to determine their character more precisely and to arrange them in their original condition. For the present we have only to deal with the fact itself.

It would, however, be possible to allow that diversity of authorship has been proved and yet to hold that the whole was composed in the days of Moses, perhaps by some of his helpers, perhaps in conjunction with himself. Even in this preliminary inquiry we are entitled to declare that such a supposition will not hold good, at any rate for a considerable portion of the narratives. For a long time past attention has been quite justifiably called to the main notices in the Hexateuch narrative which presuppose occurrences and circumstances of a later period,[4] especially of the

[1] See below, §§ 12 and 13.

[2] *Cf.* Ex. iii. 1; iv. 18; xviii. 1 f. and ii. 18, 21. On Hobab see below, § 23, No. 5.

[3] *Cf.* Num. ii. ff. and Ex. xxxiii. 7 ff.; Num. xi. 16, 26; xii. 4; Deut. xxxi. 14 f.

[4] Generally indicated by the oft-used expression: 'unto this day.' *Cf.* especially Deut. iii. 14; x. 8; xxxiv. 6; Josh. vi. 25; xix. 14; xv. 63. But the

days of the Judges and those of the earlier, and, to some extent, of the later times of the Kings. Thus the Mosaic period[1] and the dislodgement of the Canaanites are treated as events long past;[2] the Israelites dwell in the land of Canaan;[3] the regions of the sky are in part called by names which would only be appropriate in Canaan;[4] Israel has kings.[5]

§ 6. *History of Criticism.*[6]

First Period. To K. H. Graf.

1. The first attempts at a critical treatment of the Hexateuch, isolated indeed, and without system or method, were made comparatively early. They were confined for the most part to incidental remarks about various passages that excited suspicion.[7] Hobbes[8] and Isaac Peyrerius,[9] and especially Spinoza[10] and Richard Simon,[11] take a somewhat broader ground. While Peyrerius had already hit upon such passages as Deut. i. 5,

other passages also belong here, such as Gen. xix. 37 f.; xxvi. 33; xxxv. 20; xlvii. 26; Deut. ii. 22; xi. 4; Josh. iv. 9; v. 9; vii. 26; viii. 28 f.; ix 27; x. 27; xiii. 13; xvi. 10.

[1] Deut. iii. 11; Num. xxi. 14; *cf.* Josh. x. 13.

[2] Gen. xii. 6; xiii. 7; xl. 15.

[3] Deut. ii. 12; xix. 14a. *Cf.* Gen. xiv. 14; Deut. xxxiv. 1; Josh. xix. 47.

[4] *Cf.* The designation יָם; also נֶגֶב, and for the land east of the Jordan, עבר הירדן.

[5] Gen. xxxvi. 31, and the many allusions to the kingly period in the Songs, Gen. xlix.; Ex. xv.; Num. xxiv.; Deut. xxxii. f.

[6] *Cf.* Kuenen, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, iv. p. 396 ff; Merx, *Nachwort zur* 2 *Aufl. von Tuchs Kommentar über die Genesis* (1871), p. l. xxix. ff.; Diestel, *Gesch. d. Alten Testaments* (1869), § 61; Bleek-Wellhausen, *Einleit.*, p. 152 ff.; Reuss, *L'histoire sainte et la loi*, p. 10 ff; Vuilleumier in *Rev. de Théol. et de Philos.* (Laus.) 1882, ff; Steiner in *Theol. Zeitschr. a. d. Schweitz*, 1887, pp. 42 ff., 203 ff; Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism* (from Geddes and Vater to Driver), 1893; Westphal, *Les Sources du Pentateuque*, i., 1888: *Le problème littéraire*, ii. 1892: *Le problème historique.*

[7] A number of names are given by Strack, *Einleit. ins AT.* (in Zöckler's *Handb. d. Theol. Wiss.*[1]), p. 131.

[8] Leviathan (1651), chap. xxxiii.

[9] *Systema Theologicum ex praeadamitarum hypothesi* (1655), book iv.

[10] *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*, etc. Hamb. 1670. *Cf.* Siegfried, *Spinoza als Kritiker und Ausleg. d. AT.* 1867.

[11] *Histoire critique du V. Test.*, 1678. *Cf.* Bernus, *Rich. Sim.*, Lausanne, 1869.

iii. 14, xi., and the statement in Num. xxi., that a *liber bellorum Dei* was extant which had not been composed by Moses, Spinoza added a number of others (Deut. xxxi. 9; Gen. xii. 6; xxii. 14; Deut. xxxiv.), besides daring to attempt a positive view of the whole subject. He maintained that Ezra was the author of these passages. On the other hand, 'the learned Oratorian,' to use Reuss's words, 'who belonged to the last brilliant period of Catholic science,' though he did not contribute largely to the special question in which we are interested, by writing his critical history of the Old Testament became the true founder of Old Testament Introduction as a science.

Up to this time, however, no sure foundation had been laid for positive propositions concerning the genesis of the Hexateuch or of the Pentateuch—for attention was mostly limited to the latter. It was reserved for a layman, Jean Astruc,[1] physician to Louis XIV., to give the first impulse in this direction. He made the step from mere remarks and vague conjectures to the discovery of characteristic distinctions. Astruc perceived the trace of different documents in the alternation of the divine names Yahvé and Elohim in Genesis. Starting from this principle it was possible to prosecute the work further.

2. Starting in the main from Astruc's results, but working with more penetration and an incomparably larger store of knowledge, Joh. Gottfr. Eichhorn[2] developed and deepened the discovery made by his predecessor. Not the divine names only, but to an equal degree the contents of the book, indicated to him the presence of different sources in Genesis. He held that the 'genius' of the Book of Genesis compelled the belief that the greater part of this book was made up of parts of two distinct historical works. Only in this way could he understand the manifold repetitions, the varying style and phraseology, the character of the writings.

[1] *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont . . . Moyse s'est servi*, etc., 1753. On him *cf.* Böhmer's Art. 'Astruc' in *PRE.*

[2] *Einleitung in das AT.*, Leipz. 1780, ff. (4th ed. 1823 ff.).

K. Dav. Ilgen[1] carried criticism a step in advance. He aimed at making a critical contribution 'to the History of Religion and Politics' by bringing into order the documents belonging to the temple archives which in the course of time have been 'torn, broken into fragments, and then blended together' (*Vorrede*, p. xiv.). The novelty by which Ilgen is distinguished from Eichhorn is his observation that there are two distinct sources in the sections where the name Elohim is employed. Moreover, it strikes him that these sections resemble in character the Yehovistic ones (p. 393). He thus becomes the discoverer of what has long been called the later Elohist. Subsequently Ilgen's theory of a second Elohist was adopted by Hupfeld and Böhmer, and has maintained a place alongside that of Astruc up to the present day, although the manner in which it was applied, especially at the beginning of Genesis, was arbitrary and untenable.

3. Three sources having thus been discovered, it was easy to think of a fourth and a fifth. Vater's Fragment Hypothesis was developed spontaneously out of Astruc's and Ilgen's Document Hypothesis by an undue extension of the correct principle. At the same time Vater[2] extended the inquiry from Genesis to the whole Pentateuch, and came to the conclusion that all the books of the Pentateuch fall into a number of portions, larger or smaller, of which it cannot be shown that they were originally connected. Only occasionally is the thread of the narrative continued for some distance: elsewhere each book is put together as patchwork. Vater treated also the question as to when the books were thus put together, and handled it skilfully and successfully. Eichhorn had imagined that Moses kept a journal, a so-called Diary of Travel, whilst in the desert, and afterwards composed the Pentateuch from this. Vater rejected this idea, and laid most stress on the historical evidences which are to be found in the Pentateuch or other parts of the Old Testament. It does not escape him that these fail to prove the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch.

[1] *Die Urkunden des jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt*, 1798.
[2] *Commentar über den Pentateuch*, Halle, 1802 ff.

At the same time, Vater already trod the path of historical criticism with good results. A number of the facts to which he gave prominence still retain their validity in the form in which he set them forth. To him the only question for consideration was: In which of the periods subsequent to Moses was the collection formed? His answer was as follows: Deuteronomy did not originate until about the time of David or Solomon. The other parts of the Pentateuch were gradually added to it. The collection of the whole was finished about the time of the Exile.

4. At this point De Wette [1] struck in in epoch-making fashion. Vater had at least begun to make use of the material of history in addition to the literature of history, and De Wette lays all his stress on this. He is the first to make the history his starting-point in investigating the age of the Pentateuch, and he inquires whether the historical picture contained in the other historical records agrees with that given in the Pentateuch. Besides this he is quite as fortunate in dealing with the literary element of the problem, and is, too, the first to subject Deuteronomy to an independent and thorough examination. Attention was first called by him to the relation between the Chronicles on the one hand and the Books of Samuel and the Kings on the other, as regards their representation of the Worship and the Priesthood. He lays down the fundamental principle that the Chronicles are not entitled to a voice in determining the age of the Pentateuch. He is also the first to examine closely and determine the value of 2 Kings xxii., the standard passage for Deuteronomy, which relates the finding of a law-book in Joshua's reign. With him, too, originated the employment of Jer. vii. 21 ff. in Pentateuch criticism. It will therefore be seen that De Wette has already sketched in bold outlines a history of Worship in Israel, in order to obtain from it the standard by which the Pentateuch may be criticised. The question as to the place for divine worship was treated by him in a spirited manner. Whilst he comes in the first place to

[1] *Beiträge zur Einleitung ins Alte Test.*, 1806, f.

the conclusion that Deuteronomy was edited in the time of Josiah, he finds that the other books can scarcely be of very early date. The proof of this he gets chiefly from the character of the older history (*Beitr.* ii.). De Wette thus became the vanquisher of the old Rationalism in this matter. For its forced, disingenuous and tasteless explanation of words he substitutes the poetic and æsthetic mode of viewing things. The authors of the pristine Hebrew history are to him poets, and the history itself is the national epos of the Hebrew theocracy.

The principles which De Wette thus formulated in the work of his youth continued to be presented by him in the Manuel,[1] which he edited no fewer than six times. His acceptance of an epos, carried out on the lines of a definite plan, already involved at the outset a breach with Vater's Fragment-Hypothesis. In this book he completed with ever-increasing clearness the step from this to the Supplement-Hypothesis, until, in the sixth edition, he formally declared his abandonment of it in favour of Stähelin's Supplement-Hypothesis.

5. De Wette gave his attention mainly to the date and character of the Pentateuch and its several books. His co-workers and successors in the first half of our century, on the other hand, again occupied themselves rather with the question of the composition of the Pentateuch. The result was that for a time attention was once more to a certain extent limited to Genesis. The youthful Ewald, in his first book,[2] became a powerful ally of De Wette's in the endeavour to overcome the mechanical externality of Vater's Fragment Theory by laying stress on the unity of plan and the sustained connection. So deeply was he impressed by the well-considered regularity of plan discernible in the primal history that he actually believed it necessary to abandon for it the idea of a variety of sources. It was not till a later period that he became convinced of the compatibility of the

[1] *Lehrb. der histor.-krit. Einl. in die Kanon. und Apokr. Bücher des Alten Test.*, Berlin, 1817; 6th ed. 1844; 8th ed., see below.

[2] *Die Composition der Genesis*, 1823.

two ideas.[1] He then adopted the essential features[2] of Stähelin's view which had been propounded in opposition to his own. At a still later period he maintained this view in his principal work,[3] enriching it, however, with many observations of his own, and modifying it, as time went on, in accordance with the progress of science.

Stähelin[4] was the actual founder of this Supplement-Hypothesis, for which De Wette prepared the way and which Ewald took up at least in part. According to him, an ancient writing, Elohistic as far as Ex. vi., lies at the basis of our present Pentateuch, and remnants of it are found in all the five books. Then there arose a second writing, which ascribes to the earlier period later customs and the use of the name Yahvé, although it employs the name Elohim in other parts of the work. A third writer united the two, supplementing the first by the second. Bleek[5] also fell in with this view, but introduced a not unimportant modification which has ever since formed part of the Supplement-Hypothesis, maintaining that the supplementer and editor was not a third person but the author of the Yahvistic Writing. The detailed arguments for this hypothesis were given by Tuch,[6] also by Bleek in his posthumous *Introduction*.[7] To Tuch is also due the name 'Grundschrift' which has so long been used.

6. Previous to Tuch and Bleek the analysis of the sources was based chiefly on the obvious differences in the divine names. To these two authors is due the credit of laying a deeper foundation in internal characteristics. On the other hand, their hypothesis contained an element which necessarily led to a stage yet further

[1] *Stud. und Krit.*, 1831, p. 595 ff.

[2] But from the very first he takes up an independent attitude with regard to it: *cf.* Bleek,[4] p. 169, note 2.

[3] *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 1st ed. 1843 ff.; 2nd ed. 1851 ff.; 3rd ed., 1846 ff.

[4] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis*, 1830.

[5] In his Bonn Programme, *De libri Geneseos origine ac indole*, etc., 1836, a work which in other respects is directed against Böhlen

[6] *Commentar über die Genesis*, first ed. 1838.

[7] *Einl. ins Alte Test. herausg. von Joh. Bleek und A. Kamphausen*, 1860. Third ed., edited by Kamphausen, 1870; 4th ed., see below.

in advance. They ascribed to the Yehovist or supplementer things that were mutually incompatible. They made him a mere casual supplementer and at the same time the representative of a peculiar religious theory which is to be distinctly recognisable in his work. From this it was clear that more than two persons are to be brought in.

Hupfeld[1] took this step, Ewald having previously expressed some doubt. The Supplement-Hypothesis was thus overcome, and its place taken by a tendency allied to the earliest of the great hypotheses but carrying it deeper. It may thus be called the later Document Theory. The outlines of Hupfeld's view have retained their validity to the present day. Amongst the many results obtained in his book are chiefly three of abiding value,— (1.) The Yehovist, as truly as the Elohist, is an independent writer; his narratives, like the Elohist's, are connected accounts. (2.) So far is the Yahvist from being a mere supplementer that it might be asserted that he was not even acquainted with the Elohist. This is clear from the repetitions and contradictions that are found. (3.) Ilgen's Second Elohist must really be recognised as an independent source. For Hupfeld finds, in addition to the Fundamental Writing, a second Elohistic Writing in Genesis, of later date than the first.

This furnished a foundation on which further building could proceed. Böhmer[2] was the first to undertake it. He analysed many passages more carefully, paid special attention to the later Elohist and editor, and brought distinctly to view the cleavage of the sources. Schrader undertook the work that remained, independently of Hupfeld in the first instance,[3] and afterwards using his results in De Wette's *Introduction*.[4] Schrader has been specially meritorious in his careful discrimination of the sources. Knobel's *Commentary* has the same merit.[5] Both works exhibit a kind of mediation between the Supplement and the Document-

[1] *Die Quellen der Genesis*, 1853.
[2] *Liber Genesis Pentateuchicus*, 1860. *Das erste Buch der Thora*, 1862.
[3] *Studien zur Krit. und Erkl. d. bibl. Urgeschichte*, 1863.
[4] Eighth edition, 1869. [5] *Commentar zum Pentateuch und Josua*, 1852-61.

Hypotheses. The same remark applies to Ewald's *History of Israel* already mentioned, with this difference, that Knobel and Schrader show their strength more in their observation of details, Ewald more in broad and general reflections. Colenso's[1] noble work finds its most fitting mention in this connection in so far as it deals with the literary question: its strength is mainly spent on the historic.

In 1854 Riehm[2] restored Deuteronomy to its right position, after it had been for a long time unduly neglected. Specially the question whether this book had for a while a separate existence was finally set at rest by him. The further progress of criticism showed how important this recognition was.

The questions that concern the division and the nature of the sources had thus reached a sort of provisional solution. Although they were by no means finally settled, those concerning the relative and absolute age of the sources now take their place beside or instead of them.

SECOND PERIOD.

Criticism since Graf's time.

1. K. H. Graf's name indicates a fresh turn of Pentateuch criticism, because he undertook to combat the idea till then almost universally prevalent, that the so-called Foundation Writing of the Elohist was prior to the other writings in the Pentateuch, especially to Deuteronomy. At a much earlier date, Reuss,[3] Vatke,[4] George,[5] and Bohlen[6] had indeed maintained the same view, and Popper[7] had done so shortly before Graf's work appeared. But they had not succeeded in winning attention. Graf was the first to set forth a methodical and thorough proof of the

[1] *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*, 1862 ff.

[2] *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, 1854.

[3] At first in *Theses*, published in the year 1833, then in the article 'Judentum,' in *Ersch und Gruber*, Skt. ii. Bd. 27, published in 1850.

[4] *Bibl. Theologie*, i. (1835).

[5] *Die älteren jüdischen Feste*, 1835.

[6] *Commentar zur Genesis*, 1835.

[7] *Der bibl. Bericht über die Stiftshütte*, 1862.

hypothesis, which is, therefore, rightly named after him. Especially did he again bring out effectively that historical standpoint which is so universally suggestive, but since De Wette's time had been almost entirely neglected.

Graf's [1] work falls into two monographs. The first treats of Chronicles as a historical source, and comes back to De Wette's negative conclusions concerning this book. The second, which is much the more important, is an examination of the historical books from Gen. i. to 2 Kings xxv., laying special stress, however, on the Pentateuch. Graf starts with two assumptions. In the first place he works on the basis of the Supplement-Hypothesis, without taking any notice of Hupfeld. He recognises a Foundation Writing, supplemented by the Yahvist, otherwise indeed than Tuch and his friends, without the Levitical Law. Having demonstrated that Deuteronomy was composed in Josiah's time, he believes that this is the fixed point from which the remaining books may be estimated. Taking Deuteronomy as its starting-point, Graf's investigation compares it with the rest of the Pentateuch, and seeks thus to determine which portions of the Pentateuch presuppose it, and which, on the other hand, are presupposed by it. After an extensive and many-sided inquiry he reaches the result that Deuteronomy indeed knows the Yahvistic laws in Exod. xiii., xx.-xxiii., xxxiv., but not the great Elohistic Lawbook. The latter was composed after the Exile, as is clear also from the external evidence supplied by the prophets, and Ezra was most probably its compiler.

Graf's work gave occasion to a controversy between him and Riehm.[2] The latter exposed the weakness of a number of Graf's assertions, and, at all events, compelled him to define his positions more clearly. Riehm was particularly successful in demonstrating the artificiality of the separation between the legal and the narrative portions of the Elohist. Graf at once admitted that he

[1] *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Test.*, 1866.

[2] *Cf.* Riehm in *StKr.*, 1868 p. 350 ff.; Graf in Merx' *Archiv. für wissensch. Erforsch. d. Alten Testament*, 1869, p. 446 ff.; Riehm in *StKr.*, 1872, p. 283 ff.

had been mistaken in single points, but only in order to establish his main position the more surely. He concedes to Riehm that the separation is impossible. He acknowledges also, in favour of Hupfeld's Document Theory, that the Supplement-Hypothesis is not tenable.[1] But he draws the very opposite conclusion to Riehm's. If the Law and the History of the Elohist belong together, this proves to him, not that the Law has been taken up by the History into the ancient time, but that on the contrary the History has been brought down by the Law into the post-Exile period.

The problem was thus, for the first time, correctly stated. Further investigation was compelled to devote itself to the Foundation Writing and its disputed character.

2. Nöldeke's[2] work does this. He makes real use of Hupfeld's idea that the Fundamental Writing and the Yahvist were independent of each other. Such independence implies that unless considerable portions have been lost the former document can be traced through the whole Hexateuch as a connected work. The expectation was fulfilled, and from that time forward the dispute as to the extent of the Foundation Writing was substantially at an end. When this first part of the work had been done there could not be much difficulty in determining clearly the literary character of the book. Here, also, Nöldeke led the way. He showed that the tendency of the book was mainly legislative, not historical: he exhibited the artificial plan of the book, its priestly origin, and the pains taken to clothe its material in the garb of the Mosaic period.

Nöldeke admits that Graf's deductions respecting the Foundation Writing are in great part correct. It is only in the main point, the dating of the book after the Exile, that he unhesitatingly repudiates his conclusions. Yet he concedes to Graf that there is absolutely no justification for the assertion that the so-called

[1] At all events in its usual form. Speaking strictly, he reverses the order and explains the Fundamental Writing as a supplement to the Yehovist. Against this view see Riehm, *StKr.*, 1872, p. 283 ff.

[2] *Unters. z. Kritik. d. AT.* (*i. Die sogen. Grundschrift des Pentat.*), 1869.

Foundation Writing must be the oldest amongst the sources of the Pentateuch.

3. Notwithstanding this opposition, an increasing number of voices now began to be heard on Graf's side. The weightiest of these was first raised outside Germany. A. Kuenen, in his *Introduction*,[1] had followed in the main the then prevalent theory, though making many contributions of his own. Now,[2] however, he vigorously espoused Graf's thesis and enlisted many adherents, first in Holland, then by degrees in Germany also. He was followed in Germany by A. Kayser,[3] who undertook to substantiate Graf's theory by the literary-historical method, and by Duhm,[4] who fixed his attention on the relation between the prophets and the Law.

Smend[5] took the field against Duhm, whilst Kleinert,[6] limiting himself to Deuteronomy as being Graf's fulcrum, sought to prove that if it was not written by Moses it was edited soon after his death, at the very latest, say, by Samuel; Graf, on the other hand, having admitted that it was prior to the Foundation Writing. Finally Dillmann[7] opposed Graf; dealing in the first place with Genesis, making use of exegesis and the exact analysis of the sources; whilst Wellhausen, in his *Komposition des Hexateuch*,[8] and afterwards in his revision of Bleek's *Einleitung*,[9] laid the foundation for his *History of Israel*,[10] a comprehensive reconstruction on the lines of Graf's theory.

[1] *Histor.-crit. onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds.* Leiden, i., 1861.

[2] *De Godsdienst van Israel, Harl.*, 1869 f. *De vijf boeken van Moses*, Leid., 1872. Numerous contributions to the *Theol. Tijdschr.*, xi. ff.

[3] *Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels*, 1874.

[4] *Theologie der Profeten*, 1875.

[5] *Cf. Moses apud prophetas* (as early as 1875), then *StKr.*, 1876, p. 599 ff.

[6] *Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker*, 1872.

[7] Third ed. of Knobel's *Genesis*, 1875.

[8] *JDTh.*, xxi. (1876), pp. 392 ff., 532 ff., xxii. (1877), p. 407 ff. Reprinted in Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, ii., 1885.

[9] Fourth ed., 1878.

[10] *Cf.* also Delitzsch in *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.*, 1877, p. 445 ff.; Klostermann in the same, p. 401 ff., and *StKr.*, 1877, p. 391 ff.; Lagarde, *Symmicta*, 1877, p. 116 ff.

Wellhausen's *History of Israel*[1] brings the history of our question down to our own time. The movement which he initiated still continues, and the pronouncements concerning the Hexateuch which have been made since the appearance of his work all refer to the problem as he has restated it. They must, therefore, be dealt with when the matter itself is discussed, and it will be sufficient for the present if we simply mention the most noteworthy productions. We do not aim at a complete bibliography, and this least of all with regard to the, in some measure, ephemeral Anglo-American literature.

The following works may be compared: S. Y. Curtiss, *De aaronici sacerdotii atque thorae eloh. origine*, 1878 (see even earlier *The Lev. Priests*, 1877); Ryssel, *De elohistae pentateuchi sermone*, Lips., 1878; Reuss, *L'histoire sainte et la loi*, 1879; D. Hoffmann in *Magazin f. Wissensch. d. Judentums*, 1879 f.; Valeton in *Studiën* (*Theol. Tijdschr.*), 1879 ff.; Delitzsch in *Zeitschr. f. Kirkl. Wissensch*, etc., 1880; Dillmann, *Komm. zu Exodus und Leviticus*, 1880; Marti in *JPTh.*, 1880, p. 127 ff., 308 ff.; Giesebrecht in *ZAW.*, 1881, p. 177 ff.; E. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Test.*, 1881; Horst, *Levit.* xvii.-xxvi. *and Hezekiel*, 1881; Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1881 (second edition, 1892); Kayser in *JPTh.*, 1881, p. 326 ff., 520 ff., 630 ff.; Bredenkamp, *Gesetz und Profeten*, 1881; R. Kittel in *ThStW.*, 1881, p. 29 ff., 147 ff., 1882, p. 278 ff.; Delitzsch in *ZKWL.*, 1882; Dillmann, *Genesis*,[4] 1882; Driver in *Journ. of Philol.*, 1882, p. 201 ff.; Jülicher, *JPTh.*, 1882, p. 79 ff., 272 ff.; Bruston in *Revue Théologique* (Montaub.), 1882, p. 13 ff., 97 ff., and in *Revue de Théol. et Philos.* (Laus.), 1883, p. 329 ff.; Strack, *Einleit. ins Alte Testament* (in Zöckler's *Handb. d. Theol. Wiss.*), 1882, and Art. 'Pentateuch' in *PRE.*[2] (1883); Budde, *Die bibl. Urgeschichte*, 1883; Maybaum in *Zeitschr. für Völkerpsych.*, 1883, p. 191 ff.; Bissel, *Proposed Reconstr. of the Pentat.*, in *Bibl. Sacra* (Andov.), 1883 ff.; Wurster in *ZAW.*, 1884, p. 112 ff.; Curtiss,

[1] *Geschichte Israels*, i. 1878. Second and third editions, under the title *Prolegomena z. Gesch. Isr.*, 1883 and 1886.

Sketches of Pent. Crit., Bibl. Sacra, 1884; Bruston in *Rev. de Théol. et Philos.*, 1885, p. 5 ff., 499 ff., 602 ff., 1886, p. 33 ff.; Vatke's *Ansicht* in *Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol.*, p. 52 ff., 156 ff.; Vatke, *Einleit. ins Alte Test.* (edited by Preiss), 1886; Kuenen, *Hist.-crit. Onderz.*[2] i. 1, 1885 (translated into German by Weber, 1886, 1887); Dillmann, *Komment. zur Genesis*,[5] 1886; *Komment. zu Numeri, Deuter., und Jos.*, 1886; Finsler, *Darstell. und Krit. d. Ans. Wellh.*, 1887; Steiner in *Theol. Zeitschr. a.d. Schr.*, 1887, p. 203 ff.; Kautzsch und Socin, *Die Genesis mit äusserer Unterscheidung der Quellenschriften*, 1888 (2nd ed.); Horst, *Études sur le Deuteron.* (*Rev. de l'hist. d. relig.*, 1888, ff.); Baudissin, *Gesch. d. alttest. Priestertums*, 1889; Kautzsch, *Die heil. Schrift Alt. Test. übersetzt*, 1890 ff.; Driver, *Introduction*, 1891; Cornill, *Einl. ins AT.*,[2] 1892; Dillm. *Gen.*[6] 1892; König, *Einl. ins AT.*, 1893; Holzinger, *Einl. in den Hexat.*, 1893; Klostermann, *Der Pentat.*, 1893.

§ 7. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic Fragments.*

1. THE COMPILATION OF THE EXTANT BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY. THE ORIGINAL KERNEL.

The history of criticism gives the reader such an idea of the attempts hitherto made at solving the problem as will convince him that before Hebrew history can be written, the main sources of the Hexateuch must be separated and dated. This applies especially to the great Elohistic Priestly Writing (formerly called the Foundation Writing), the Yahvist and the so-called second Elohist. The better way of referring to them is as P, J, and E, respectively. But the position of these writings can only be determined by fixing first their relation to Deuteronomy. The latter contains much less historical material than the other writings just mentioned, yet it must be our starting-point. For Deuteronomy may be looked on as the fixed point from which we can work both backwards and forwards. By ascertaining their relation to this book we shall therefore at least discover the general limits of time within which the other writings lie. We know that in the reign

of Josiah a Law Book was discovered in the Temple at Jerusalem, which we have preponderating reasons for believing to have been our Book of Deuteronomy.[1] It is, however, just as certain that the Law Book found in Josiah's time did not contain the whole book now comprised under the name of Deuteronomy. The first question, therefore, that arises refers to the constituent elements and the original kernel of the present Deuteronomy.

If chaps. i.-iv. and xxvii. ff. are compared with the extensive section in the middle of the book, or with each other, it becomes plain that the present Deuteronomy is not a perfectly homogeneous book.[2] If those two outer parts, the Introduction, chap. i.-iv., and the Epilogue, chap. xxvii. ff., be provisionally taken away, the remainder, chap. v.-xxvi., will be the true kernel of the book.

Wellhausen has opposed this view.[3] In his opinion the original Deuteronomy includes[4] no more than chap. xii.-xxvi. He can hardly think that we have a part of the original work in the longer Introduction, chap. v.-xi., 'that insistent demand for the observance of commandments which have not yet been given and of which the contents are but partially indicated in advance.' For 'the laws begin at chap. xii. Up to then Moses is always about to come to the point but never does so.' As early as chap. v. 1, he announces the statutes and judgments which the people are to observe in the land of Canaan, but immediately becomes involved in the historic recital. At the opening of chap. vi. he again makes as though he would promulgate the statutes and judgments, but again leaves this undone. So is it in the following chapters.[5]

No one who reads Deuteronomy continuously will be inclined to deny that this is a correct account of the relation between the two parts, Deut. v.-xi., and Deut. xii.-xxvi. Yet the question

[1] Wellh., *JDTh.* xxii. p. 458 f.

[2] Wellh. xxii. p. 460 f.

[3] *JDTh.* xxii. p. 462 ff.

[4] Following Vater, *Abhandlung über Moses und die Verfasser des Pentateuchs.* (*Comm.* iii. pp. 393-738, especially 458 ff.) But compare now Wellhausen's remarks in *Deutsch. Lit. Zeit.*, 1887, No. 14, where an attempt is also made to distinguish certain elements from the rest of the original Deuteronomy.

[5] Similarly Valeton, *Studien*, vi. p. 157 ff.

must be asked whether the conclusions Wellhausen has drawn from this are justified. For they are neither intrinsically necessary nor do they explain what they are supposed to explain. If in other respects the Introduction bears the marks of close connection with the exposition, then the fact of its being written in a circumstantial fashion which does not come to the point, does not prove it to be due to a different hand from that which wrote the latter. And on the other hand the relation between the two series of chapters is not fully explained by this supposition. An author may linger over his preparatory matter and his announcements of what he means to do, and for a long time fail to reach his real subject. In our daily experience we frequently find both speakers and writers acting thus, and as long as the world stands this will be psychologically comprehensible. But that another man should have felt himself compelled to provide a long-winded prologue like Deut. v.-xi. for a book which is fairly well arranged and for the most part tells its own tale, is an undertaking which it would not be easy to comprehend. The entire procedure would be meaningless.

Wellhausen has entirely failed to establish the diversity of authorship by a comparison of statements or of language. In fact these considerations tell against his view.

So far as facts are concerned the situation is precisely the same in chap. xii.-xxvi. as in v.-xi. Kuenen[1] rightly calls attention to the identity of standpoint in xii. ff. with that of the Superscription[2] to v.-xxvi. Chap. xii.-xxvi. seem to be as clearly founded on this superscription as chap. v.-xi. The Decalogue in chap. v. should also be borne in mind.[3] Considering the close relation in which chap. xii.-xxvi. stand to the older law—to use this expression by anticipation—it would be in the highest degree astonishing if the editor of these chapters had not reproduced also the principal constituent of that law, the Decalogue. If he placed the Ten Commandments in chap. v., at the head of his book, its

[1] *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 7.
[2] Deut. iv. 45-49.
[3] See also Kayser, *JPTh.* vii. p. 532.

omission afterwards is explained. But if the original book consisted only of chap. xii.-xxvi. the absence of the Decalogue is highly surprising.[1]

But the comparison of the phraseolgy, which has been carried out with almost absolute completeness by Kuenen and Dillmann,[2] is of peculiar importance. Any one who will compare the characteristic turns of speech in chap. v.-xi. with those in xii.-xxvi. will find the agreement in form so close that the idea of a diversity of authorship will only seem to introduce a new problem, the solving of which would involve incomparably greater difficulties than those which are pressed upon him by the acceptance of the unity of authorship.

It is no doubt another question whether Deut. v.-xi. was written at the same time and on the same impulse as xii.-xxvi. or not. Kuenen, who unhesitatingly, and, as I believe, with convincing reasons, maintains the unity of authorship, has contested this.[3] He holds that the editor of chap. xii.-xxvi. wrote the Introduction (v.-xi.), afterwards referring in it to the laws which had then already been collected.

I cannot give my adhesion to this view of Kuenen's. A considerable portion of the objections already taken to the diversity of authorship seem to me to tell against the difference of dates accepted by him. The absence of the Ten Commandments, the introduction of which, according to this view, would wear the same character of a mere later emendation which it has on Wellhausen's view; the strangeness of so prolix a preface being added subsequently; the complete correspondence of the whole with the superscription of the first part, a correspondence far less to be expected if a lengthy interval had elapsed between the editing of the two parts than if they were edited at the same time; all these considerations seem to refute Kuenen's suggestion.[4]

If then we may regard the section, Deut. v.-xxvi., whether with

[1] On other points, *cf.* Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, Nos. 8 and 9.
[2] Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, Nos. 4 and 10; Dillm. *NuDtJo*, pp. 236 f., 292.
[3] Ond.[2] § 7, No. 11.
[4] Further *cf.* Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, pp. 263 f., 292 f.

or without its Superscription (iv. 45-49), as a homogeneous whole, composed at one and the same time, we may recognise in this section the very Deuteronomy which was discovered in Josiah's reign. We call this original kernel of our present Deuteronomy by the brief designation D.

What is the relation between it and its framework, chap. i.-iv. 44, and chap. xxvii. ff.?

As far as the introductory chapters (i.-iv. 44) are concerned, it has long been recognised that they do not stand on quite the same footing as the kernel of the book. The very fact of their being followed by the detailed heading (iv. 45-49), which gives circumstantial information about dates and places as if they were new, although they have long been familiar to the reader from i. ff.; the further fact that the legislation proper of chap. xii. ff. is already sufficiently provided with an introduction in chap. v.-xi.; finally, a number of discrepancies of statement, all confirm this conclusion.

On these grounds, and especially because of the differences between their respective contents,[1] Klostermann,[2] Hollenberg,[3] Wellhausen,[4] Valeton,[5] Kuenen,[6] and others,[7] have concluded that chap. i.-iv. were not written by D himself but by another author. But the close agreement in phraseology between this section and the one written by D[8] compels us to believe that the author must in any case have been closely connected with D, whether he be recognised as R^d or an earlier writer, belonging to D's school (D^2).

Hollenberg's opinion that the author of Deut. i.-iv. is to be considered as identical with R^d is out of harmony with the important consideration that the contents of Deut. i.-iv. presupposes the narratives in Exodus and Numbers.[9] An editor who wished to write Deuteronomy with the rest of the books could

[1] On these see especially Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 17.
[2] *StKr.*, 1871, p. 253 ff.
[3] *StKr.*, 1874, p. 467 ff.
[4] *JDTh.* xxii. p. 460 ff.
[5] *Studien*, vi. p. 460 ff.
[6] *Ond.*[2] p. 116 ff.
[7] For instance, Reuss, *Hist. Sainte*, etc., p. 209 ff.; Kayser, *JDTh.* vii. p. 533.
[8] See especially Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 17, No. 16; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 229.
[9] Kosters, *Die historie-beschouwing van den Deuteronomist*, p. 32 ff.

have had no reason for repeating the narratives already given,[1] and that, too, with some discrepancies of detail. On the contrary, this repetition has no object unless it was conceived and composed as a portion of the still independent Deuteronomy.

Moved by this consideration the rest of the scholars mentioned above have ascribed Deut. i.-iv. to a successor of the original D spiritually related to him. Both characteristics of Deut. i.-iv., its similarity to D and its divergence from him, appear to be satisfactorily explained on this supposition, especially as it is thought possible to show the likelihood of the similarity in phraseology—which, however, is modified by single differences in detail—having arisen through imitation.[2]

This view is decidedly preferable to the older one of Knobel, Graf, Kosters, and others, according to which D himself, sooner or later, after the composition of Deut. v.-xxvi., prefixed this Introduction to his book. On that view the manifold differences between the two parts remain unexplained.

Dillmann, however, has recently opposed the newer view with great energy.[3] He attempts an entirely new and peculiar solution of the problem. Starting with the characteristic differences between the two main portions of which Deut. i. 6-iv. 43 is made up, *i.e.* Deut. i. 6-iii. 29 on the one hand and iv. 1-40 on the other, he believes that a distinction must be drawn between them. He explains the first as a historical Introduction to Deuteronomy subsequently transformed by R^d into a speech by Moses. The motive of R^d's procedure is obvious. There seemed to him to be no meaning in a historical Introduction to Deuteronomy substantially identical with the narrative in Exodus and Numbers. He did not feel justified in omitting it entirely; he therefore altered it into an introductory speech by Moses, the ostensible object of which should be the bringing the historical situation before the eyes of his audience. Dillmann is of course able to appeal first in favour of this view to the marked agreement in phraseology and statement

[1] Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 15; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 228.
[2] Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 16. [3] Die Bücher, *NuDtJo.*, pp. 228 ff., 599.

between these chapters and D himself, an agreement which will always carry weight, whereas the majority of the differences may easily be credited to R^d, the reviser.[1] Variations as to facts would not be explicable thus, but Dillmann does not think there are any.[2] The matter presents a somewhat different aspect to Dillmann when he turns to the second portion, iv. 1-40. He, like others, sees that this hortatory address is proved to be out of place by the long exhortation which follows. He ascribes to R^d its removal to the place it now occupies. But he has no hesitation in attributing the speech itself to D, holding that it originally stood amongst the concluding speeches after chap. xxvi. This satisfactorily explains the designation of the immediately succeeding Deuteronomy as 'this law,' a designation which in the present order of the chapters has given rise to well-grounded objections.[3]

It cannot be denied that this theory of the relation between the first four chapters and the rest of Deuteronomy is an exceedingly noteworthy contribution to the solution of a very complicated problem.[4] I frankly admit that it is not only as probable as the other explanation which attributes i.-iv. to D^2, but that it has many decided advantages over it. Amongst the points in its favour I specially reckon the altogether unforced manner in which it explains, on the one hand, the great similarity between the language of these chapters and of D respectively, and the smaller differences by which they are distinguished, and, on the other hand, the fact of this Introduction being prefixed to D. The introduction as it now runs presents great difficulties even on the supposition that D^2 was the author. Plausible reasons may perhaps be adduced to show how a successor, and at the same time imitator, of D came to preface his predecessor's book with an

[1] Especially ii. 14 ff. He thus finds the explanation of the collision into which this passages comes with v. 2 f. and xi. 2 ff.

[2] As to the principal passage, ii. 29, in relation to xxiii. 5, *cf.* his *Kommentar*; also Graf, *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 18; Kleinert, *Das Deuteron.*, etc., pp. 34, 181.

[3] Deut. iv. 8 and v. On this *cf.*, *e.g.*, Wellhausen, xxii. p. 462.

[4] Dillmann is necessitated by his general treatment of the subject to assign the superscription, iv. 44 ff., to R^d. In point of language there is nothing to be said against this. *Cf. NuDtJo.*, p. 261.

Introduction (i.-iii.) drawn up from Exodus and Numbers. But the hortatory portion of these chapters, *i.e.* chap. iv., will not be accounted for so easily. The admonitory introduction of the law is sufficiently given in chap. v.-xi. Chap. iv. makes no fresh contribution. To me this difficulty seems to preclude the idea of a D^2 having written Deut. i.-iv. On the theory that chap. iv. belonged to the hortatory peroration there is nothing surprising save its position, and Dillmann can explain this satisfactorily. Besides which his account of the origin of chap. i.-iii. is more attractive than the other. For our present Deuteronomy, from chap. i.-xi., pursues its course in an undeniably heavy and awkward fashion. Must not the supposed D^2 himself have felt how clumsy his own introductory speech would look when prefixed to the one contained in his model? Perhaps a future scholar may deduce from this the conclusion that for this very reason i.-iv., or at least i.-iii., was originally written by D^2 in narrative form and afterwards transformed into an address by R^d. For my own part I shrink from any further complication of the problem. But I deem it certain that Deut. i.-iii. was not composed in its present form. I believe Dillmann to be right in holding that an author could only have prefixed a narrative introduction to the lengthy speech. The chapters as they now stand must, in my judgment, have been the work of a reviser who, if he did not wish to damage unduly the material at his disposal, had no choice but to change the narrative into a speech. For the narrative in Deut. i.-iii. would lose all its significance as a narrative when Deuteronomy came to be joined to the accounts from Exodus and Numbers which are here reproduced.

Dillmann's view would be more assured if he succeeded in his attempt to show that the writer had J and E before him as independent writings. If in spite of this I cannot make up my mind to assent unreservedly to his view, this is because the suspicion of disagreement between some passages on points of fact remains. Hence it seems to me that even Dillmann's explanation has not provided a final solution of the problem. Unless we are prepared to venture on a fresh explanation we must leave the

question open, seeing what difficulties there are in the interpretation offered by Kuenen and the others. It is but of subordinate importance in determining our estimate of the history.

As to the closing portion of Deuteronomy, chap. xxvii.-xxxiv., there is a substantial agreement in many directions. The section, xxxii. 48-52,[1] some elements of chap. xxxiv.,[2] the Song, chap. xxxii. 1-44, and the Blessing, chap. xxxiii. 1-29,[3] are acknowledged in any case to have no connection with the original Deuteronomy. The same conclusion may with great probability be drawn of chap. xxxi. 14-23.[4] The only passages in the second part of the concluding section, xxxi.-xxxiv., that are Deuteronomic in contents and in language are some elements of chap. xxxiv.,[5] together with the small fragments, Deut. xxxii. 45-47, and xxxi. 24-30. In their case as in that of the decidedly Deuteronomic mass of the first part, chap. xxvii. 1-xxxi. 13, the question must arise in the same way as for chap. i.-iv. whether they are to be ascribed to D himself or to one of his successors.

It is admitted that Deut. xxvii. 9, 10, and xxxi. 9-13[6] are from D himself. And notwithstanding Wellhausen's[7] and Kleinert's[8] contradiction this can also be proved of chap. xxviii.,[9] although, according to the nature of the case, minor additions to this speech by R^d in not altogether inconsiderable numbers are not excluded.

[1] See below, § 22.

[2] See below, §§ 20, 21, 22.

[3] See below, § 21. This is denied by Schultz, *Deut.*, p. 649 ff., and Keil, *NuDtJo.*, p. 537 f.

[4] See below, § 21. On the relation between *vv.* 14 f., 23 and *vv.* 16-22, see Klostermann, *StKr.*, 1871, p. 249 ff.; Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 20; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 388.

[5] At all events *v.* 11 f. belongs to this, as well as parts of *v.* 4 (Dillm., parts of 5 and 1?) and 6.

[6] See Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 21; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, pp. 364, 386 f. For the rest, with reference to chap. xxvii., *cf.* especially Kuenen in *Theol. Tijdschr.* xii. p. 297 ff.

[7] *JDTh.* xxii. p. 461 (the whole chapter secondary).

[8] *Das Deuteronomium*, etc. p. 205 f. (considerable portions secondary): *cf.* also Valeton, *Studien*, vii. p. 44 f., and Kayser, *JPTh.*, 1881, p. 530 f.

[9] See Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 21; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 370. Likewise Graf, *Gesch. Bücher.*, p. 8; Klostermann, Hollenberg.

Of the remaining sections it is recognised that the following are not from D himself: Deut. xxvii. 1-8, 11-13, 14-26.[1] They point to a writer who followed D's thoughts and language.

There is less certainty about the rest:—the great hortatory address in Deut. xxviii. 69-xxx. 20; the sections xxxi. 24-30, xxxii. 45-47; and chap. xxxiv., in so far as it is Deuteronomic. There can be no doubt that several of these sections, particularly the speech in chap. xxix. f., are deeply stamped with the signs of a later hand.[2] This may easily have been R^d. On the other hand the possibility that the substance of them comes from D is not to be rejected on *à priori* grounds.[3] It may be that a conclusive answer, especially with reference to such sections as chap. xxxiv., cannot be given: at all events it cannot here. The question is connected with our judgment respecting D in the Book of Joshua. We have already seen that there are many reasons for thinking D was in possession of a narrative. If so, and if he continued it beyond chap. xxvi., especially into the Book of Joshua, there is obviously no reason for denying that he wrote the story of the death of Moses. If this was not the case, there can be no further dispute concerning these sections.

2. DATE OF THE COMPOSITION OF D.

The question as to the composition of D, with which we are here concerned, will not be directly touched by the answer to that other question, whether Deut. iv. 44-xxvi., together with Deut. xxviii. and the elements separated from chap. xxvii. and xxxi., formed the original contents of Deuteronomy or, on the other hand, it consisted of Deut. i.-xxx., excluding here also minor additions by R^d, but taking in some fragments of the following chapters and elements of the Book of Joshua. Not till we come to discuss the Deuteronomic portions of the Book of

[1] Graf, *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 8; Kayser, *Vorexil. Büch.*, p. 101; Kuenen, *Theol. Tijdschr.* xii. p. 297 ff., and *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 22; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 364.

[2] Hence Kuenen, § 7, Nos. 20 and 22, ascribes them to D^2.

[3] Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, pp. 379, 390, asserts this of chap. xxix. f. and xxxi. 24-30, whilst attributing xxxii. 45-47 (p. 412) to D alone.

Joshua will the opportunity be likely to arise of drawing from the result here obtained a further conclusion respecting the probable compass of D.

The Book of Kings contains,[1] as is known, a full account of the discovery of a Law Book in the Temple at Jerusalem. In the eighteenth year of King Josiah a book was found in the temple. The priest Hilkiah, through whose hands it passes, gives it to Shaphan, the king's scribe, with the remark that this is 'the' Law Book. The king himself has the book read to him, and is terror-stricken by the threatenings it contains. On the advice of the prophetess Huldah, he introduces a reform in the cultus, the outlines of which are described by the Book of Kings.

The account bears all the marks of trustworthiness. It may have been composed not much more than fifty years after the events it narrates. Nor can there be any doubt that when Hilkiah spoke of the Law Book he was thinking of a Mosaic[2] book, although he does not mention the name of Moses.

For obvious reasons it was long believed that this book was our Pentateuch.[3] It was supposed to have been completed centuries before,[4] and then to have been lost in the course of time, especially during the reigns of Josiah's idolatrous predecessors. The sole remaining copy, buried in the temple amidst rubbish and lumber, was found in Josiah's time.

This theory is for many reasons untenable. We briefly mention the most important:[5]—

(1.) 'All the words of the book,' consequently the whole of the contents of the book, were publicly read aloud twice within a

[1] 2 Kings xxii. and xxiii. [2] Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 352.

[3] The older writers. In modern times Hengstenberg, Keil and others, especially Riehm, *Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 98, and Kleinert, *Deuteronomium*, p. 251 ff.

[4] According to Riehm, *ut supra*, p. 98 ff., Deuteronomy was not composed till Manasseh's reign, when it was added to the rest. Subsequently Riehm pronounced in favour of its having been composed in Hezekiah's time. Kleinert believes it was written in Samuel's time. On this see below, p. 61.

[5] *Cf.* especially De Wette-Schrader, *Einl.*[8] p. 323; Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 352 ff.; Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 1 ff.; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 613 f.

short interval, probably on one and the selfsame day.[1] It is not conceivable that the entire Pentateuch could be got through so rapidly. I believe it to be a not exaggerated estimate that twenty-three hours and a half would be required to read the whole Pentateuch aloud at a moderately quick rate so as to allow of its being understood. And it would occupy sixteen and two-thirds hours to read through nothing but the 'Law Book,' omitting, that is, the historical introduction and beginning at Ex. xix. But this abbreviation could not be justified.

(2.) The book is called 'Book of the Law'[2] and 'Book of the Covenant.'[3] The former title in itself might lead us to conjecture that the Pentateuch is meant: but the latter makes this impossible. The Pentateuch as a whole never bears this name: it belongs only to single portions.

(3.) It is utterly impossible that the whole Pentateuch should have vanished without leaving a trace of its existence: the older and, consequently, the better known it was, the greater the impossibility. Even if the one copy deposited in the Temple had disappeared, there must always have been others in existence in the priestly circles and amongst those Israelites who remained true to Yahvé.

The two first of the above-mentioned reasons indicate clearly that the book found in Josiah's reign contained only a portion of the Pentateuch. Unsought, and almost of its own accord, Deuteronomy stands forth amidst the independent constituents of the great Law Book which bears the name of Moses as being this portion. At the present day there can hardly be any longer a serious doubt as to its being identical with Josiah's book. We put together briefly the weightiest reasons for believing this:—

(*a.*) Amongst the books we now possess the name 'Book of the Covenant' can only be applied, so far as we know, to the one mentioned at Ex. xxiv. 7, or to Deuteronomy.[4] The one men-

[1] 2 Kings xxii. 10; xxiii. 2.
[2] 2 Kings xxii. 8, 11; xxiii. 24 f.
[3] 2 Kings xxiii. 2 f., 21.
[4] *Cf.* Deut. xxvi. 17-19; v. 3; xxviii. 69.

tioned in Exodus[1] is put out of the question by the character of its contents. The probabilities are therefore in favour of our book. To this must be added that the other name, 'Book of the Law,' given to the work which Josiah knew, is the ordinary name for Deuteronomy both in the book itself and elsewhere.[2]

(*b.*) The size of Deuteronomy agrees with the data of the Book of Kings. On the scale adopted above a single reading of Deut. i.-xxxiv. would take four hours, twelve minutes. If, when we speak of D, we may deduct at least some chapters of our present book, and if the Book of Joshua no longer contains any remnants of D, the reading would occupy from three to four hours. Taking in these remnants from Joshua a little over four hours would still suffice for reading the whole book in moderately quick time.

(*c.*) But the contents of D furnish the special proof that this book corresponds more than any other portion of the Pentateuch with the assumptions made in the Book of Kings. It is a distinguishing characteristic of the law described in the Book of Kings that its contents filled the king with alarm.[3] If we compare with this the threatenings which are often[4] uttered in Deuteronomy, especially in chap. xxviii., the probability in favour of our book will be heightened, for these threats of punishment far surpass in severity and awfulness any contained elsewhere in the Pentateuch.[5]

(*d.*) On the same line stand two other reasons which demonstrate irresistibly the identity of the Book of Josiah with D. The immediate consequence of becoming acquainted with this book is a thorough reform of the cultus: the high-places are swept away, the sacrifices are centralised[6] at the Temple, diviners

[1] Vatke declared in favour of this, *Bibl. Theol.* i. pp. 504 ff., 511. Against it see Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 3. Vatke repeats his original opinion in his *Hist. Krit. Einl. ins A T.* (1886), p. 385.

[2] Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 10, Nos. 24, 25.

[3] 2 Kings xxii. 13.

[4] *Cf.* Deut. vi. 15; viii. 19 f.; ix. 13; xi. 28.

[5] Seinicke, *Gesch. d. Volk. Israel*, i. p. 386 f., opposes this argument because the threatenings in Deuteronomy are only hypothetical. Against this, see Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 3.

[6] 2 Kings xxiii. 4 ff.

and enchanters are got rid of.[1] It is only in Deuteronomy that these reforms are prescribed, but in it the prescriptions are as definite as possible.[2]

(*c.*) The further consequence of the acquaintance with that book is a great celebration of the Passover by the whole people. It is pre-supposed and expressly declared that the ceremony is to be in accordance with the newly-found law.[3] Now the details of the festival correspond with the laws of the Passover in Deuteronomy and not with those given elsewhere in the Pentateuch.[4]

The law-book found in Josiah's reign must consequently have been D. This indeed involves no assertion respecting the age of D. The only deduction that can be made from what has hitherto been advanced, is that the argument under *c.*, p. 60, is not altogether favourable to the idea of D's great antiquity. If it is quite incredible that the entire Pentateuch, after being published, and for a long time openly recognised, disappeared, and, as the narrative in the Book of Kings assumes, left not a trace behind, then the same kind of incredibility, though not in the same degree, attaches to the loss of an essential part of the whole. Every one can understand single copies of the book being lost. But it is difficult to believe that all the copies had completely disappeared, and all memory of its contents been obliterated from the hearts of Yahvé's worshippers, and this at a time when in many quarters His worship was faithfully preserved. For the Book of Kings treats the discovered book as something entirely novel, until then, or at least at that time, unknown.[5]

With this agrees the fact, that the book itself supplies proofs of being a comparatively late writing.[6]

The language of Deuteronomy has many points of contact with that of the eighth and seventh centuries. Its manner of state-

[1] 2 Kings xxiii. 24 f.

[2] Deut. xii. 8; xviii. 9 f. *Cf.* further xiii. 1 ff., 7 ff., 13 ff.; xiv. 23 ff; xv. 20; xvii. 8, 10; xxvi. 2.

[3] 2 Kings xxiii. 21 f.

[4] Deut. xvi. 1 ff.

[5] *Cf.* Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 352 f.

[6] Against Kleinert, *Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker*, 1872, who, as is well known, seeks to prove that it was composed in Samuel's days, *cf.* especially Riehm, *StKr.*, 1873, p. 165 ff.; Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 5.

ment sounds anything but fresh and original. Frequent repetitions, marked prolixity, a certain breadth of statement and not infrequent broken constructions are the characteristics of its style. Obviously they do not point to the mere beginnings of a literature but to an advanced stage of familiarity with the arts of public writing and speaking.[1] This argument is considerably strengthened by the relation of dependence which, as we are about to show,[2] our book sustains towards other parts of the Hexateuch.

The contents of the book lead to the same conclusion. Here also attention is to be directed in the first place to the relation now to be pointed out between D on the one hand, and J and E, particularly E, on the other. But apart from this many reasons prove a later date. The law of the king[3] in D is shown to belong to the period of the Kings by the fact that the actual evil courses pursued by the kings who followed Solomon are reproved in it.[4] There is nothing to justify us in separating[5] this portion from the rest of D.[6] The law relating to the appellate jurisdiction[7] presupposes that for some time there had already been such a jurisdiction in Jerusalem. Now, neither in the period of the judges, nor in that of the earlier kings, have we any notice of its existence. But we learn from the Chronicles[8] that Jehoshaphat established a court of this kind. Further, the frequent references to the place which Yahvé would choose, can hardly point to anything but the Temple at Jerusalem.[9] Taken by themselves, we might, no doubt, understand them as predictions concerning the one sanctuary which should afterwards be chosen. But a closer examination of the language and context of the declarations in question creates a definite impression that the

[1] See Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 611. [2] See § 8, No. 1. [3] Deut. xvii. 14 ff.

[4] In opposition to Hengstenberg, Keil and others, see especially Riehm, *Gesetzgeb. Mosis*, p. 82 f. ; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 322 f. ; Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 5.

[5] As is done, for example, by Wellhausen, xxii. p. 463 ; Diestel, *JPTh.* v. (1879) p. 286. Somewhat differently in Kleinert, *Deut.* etc., p. 243.

[6] *Cf.* Riehm, *StKr.*, 1873, p. 186 f. ; Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 11 ; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 321 ff. [7] Deut. xvii. 8. ff. [8] 2 Chron. xix. 8 ff.

[9] See Deut. xii. 5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26 ; xiv. 23 ff. ; xv. 20 ; xvi. 2, 6 f., 11, 15 f. ; xvii. 8, 10 ; xviii. 6 ; xxvi. 2 f.

sanctuary denoted by these general expressions stood before the author's mind in consequence of a clear personal experience.[1]

This brings us within the period of the Temple, and indeed, at the earliest, to the reign of Jehoshaphat. But a glance at the manner in which this idea of the centralisation of divine service in Jerusalem makes its appearance in other parts of Israelite literature compels us to come down at least as late as Hezekiah's time. Before the idea could appear in the law its way had to be prepared by the prophets and its foundation laid by pointing to the pre-eminence of Jerusalem. This was first done *negatively* by the prophets after Amos, in their depreciation of the high places, and *positively* by Isaiah.[2] Hezekiah was the first to make a practical attempt to bring about the centralisation.[3] But it seems to have been only an attempt.[4] At any rate Hezekiah did not appeal to a law-book[5] like Deuteronomy, as he certainly must have done if he had been acquainted with it. And the opinion that D was in existence in Hezekiah's time, but had not yet been discovered, is also rendered improbable by the warning which the book contains against the worship of the host of heaven[6] as a special form of idolatry. This points to a somewhat lower date, namely, that of Manasseh. We hear of that kind of worship for the first time from the prophets of the seventh century,[7] such as Jeremiah[8] and Zephaniah,[9] whilst the Book of Kings expressly states that it was introduced by Manasseh.[10]

Hence the only remaining question is whether the book originated in Manasseh's reign and remained concealed till Josiah's, or

[1] *Cf.* especially באחד שבטיך in the whole context of the speech. It would almost be allowable to render: 'In the well-known tribe.'

[2] Isa. ii. 2 f.; iv. 5; xviii. 7; xxviii. 16; xxx. 29; xxxi. 9; xxxiii. 14, 20.

[3] 2 Kings xviii. 4, 22; xxi. 3.

[4] The doubt as to its being a historical occurrence (Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 26, 48 f.; Eng. Trans., pp. 46, 47) is unjustifiable. See Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 11, No. 9.

[5] See Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 2.

[6] Deut. xvii. 3 f.; iv. 19.

[7] Kleinert gives a wrong interpretation of it (*Deuter.* p. 106 ff.). Against the entire argument with respect to the later origin of D, see Kleinert, p. 83 ff. and also Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 5.

[8] Jer. viii. 2; xix. 13 f.; xxxiii. 32.

[9] Zeph. i. 5.

[10] 2 Kings xxi. 3, 5; *cf.* xxiii. 4 f.

whether it was published immediately after its composition and so was composed in the time of Josiah. In the latter case, if it was not actually written by Hilkiah and Shaphan, this probably was done with their knowledge and co-operation.[1] Each of these views has found advocates.[2]

In proof of its having been published immediately after its composition under Josiah it is urged that from the outset Deuteronomy was meant for publication,[3] not for concealment: and special stress is laid on the consideration that on the other view those who took part in carrying out the reform, not being, at the same time, its intellectual originators, played the part of mere blind tools.[4] I cannot regard these reasons as conclusive. At all events it is impossible to determine how long the book was hidden in the Temple. But the fact of its having been found on the occasion of a structural alteration of the Temple seems to me to prove that it had been actually hidden and this for a fair length of time, not a few days or weeks merely. This presupposes that it was quite accidentally found in some out-of-the-way place and did not lie open to any one's observation in the Temple—otherwise we must admit that a mystification was attempted.

The last-named idea is absolutely precluded by the narrative in the Book of Kings, the credibility of which we have no ground for doubting. Besides this, Hilkiah's co-operation is made highly improbable by Deuteronomy itself.[5] Now the theocratic disposition of Josiah renders it impossible to imagine any sufficient motive for the temporary concealment of the book. Hence it seems to me to be the most correct view that Manasseh's reign should be regarded as the time when D was composed.

[1] *E.g.* Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 352: 'nominally a discovery of the priests.'

[2] Manasseh's reign: Ewald (fortified by a daring hypothesis founded on xxviii. 68), Riehm (earlier), Bleek, Valeton, Driver. Josiah's reign: Knobel, Graf, Schrader, Reuss, Kuenen, Dillmann, Kautzsch, Cheyne, Baudissin, Cornill, Holzinger—partly with a denial of Hilkiah's co-operation.

[3] Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 614.

[4] Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 6.

[5] Deut. xviii. 6-8, and the comparatively small endowment which it usually gives to the priests, particularly when contrasted with P. *Cf.* also the language used in Deut. xii. 12, 19: it does not suit the mouth of a priest in Jerusalem.

The process can be most simply represented as follows. A man of prophetic character, faithful to Yahvé, stirred by Hezekiah's attempted reform and by Manasseh's idolatry, wrote the book in the reign of the latter. The troubles of the times and the hostile disposition of the king deterred him from publishing it. He had no wish to risk his own safety and the usefulness of his book. Hoping for better days, he concealed it in the Temple. The author may not have survived the long reign of Manasseh, or he would soon have come forward with his book after Josiah's accession. It appears to have been thus forgotten and only found by a fortunate accident in the eighteenth year of Josiah.[1]

Hilkiah and Shaphan are thus exculpated from every kind of disingenuousness. And what is more, this reproach, which has frequently been made against the author,[2] cannot seriously touch him. He felt that he was propounding to his people Mosaic ideas and Mosaic ordinances, provided merely with a new dress and application. Still further, as a man of indubitably prophetic mind, he was conscious that in giving new point to the ancient Mosaic ordinances, and in adapting to the needs of a more advanced and in many respects corrupt age much that had originated with Moses, or in the course of time had been added in his spirit and therefore under his name, he was filled with the special commission and the revealing light of his God. Have we of to-day, who with our modern ideas, can only with difficulty and to a slight extent transport ourselves into the spiritual life of those ancient days, the right to censure a man who so unmistakably bears the mark of the true God-inspired prophet? Have we a right to reproach him with fraud, pious or impious? May we doubt the divineness of that commission by virtue of which he called to life again the

[1] There is no reason for adopting a still later date, as, *e.g.*, B. Vatke, *Einl. ins. AT.* p. 385 f., would. The passages adduced in proof are partly to be explained in another way and partly to be set down to R^{d}. Zunz in *ZDMG.* xxvii. p. 670 ff., and Colenso, *The Pentat. and Book of Joshua*, vii., App. p. 85 ff., maintained that Jeremiah was the composer. Against them see Klein., *Deut.* p. 186 ff.; Duhm, *Theol. d. Proph.*, p. 240 ff.; Kuenen, *Ond.*^{2} § 10, No. 14; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 614.

[2] Orelli, *e.g.*, repeats this, *PRE.*^{2} xiv. p. 720 ff.

earliest heroic figure of the theocracy for the benefit of a generation which was sinking into idolatry and a false worship of Yahvé, and drawing upon the words and the spirit of the greatest lawgiver set before later times a law that was new and yet was the old Mosaic one? He knew that what he propounded was Yahvé's revelation and Moses's meaning. Had Moses looked on the author's times he could not have spoken otherwise than he makes him speak. He therefore bids Moses himself in prophetic garb lift up his voice to the generation that is gone, but with a glance at a distant future. But the harmlessness, the half-poetic character, of the garb is ensured by the almost intentional manner in which the actual state of affairs is now and again allowed to pass through.

3. THE DEUTERONOMIC FRAGMENTS IN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

There yet remains the difficult question as to the origin of the Deuteronomic elements in the Book of Joshua. It has long been admitted that this book contains considerable portions which exhibit a surprising likeness to D in terminology and ideas.[1] In the first part of the book, chap. i.-xii., they can be distinguished with a fair amount of ease and unanimity, but as to the second part, chap. xiii.-xxiv., there is as yet but little agreement. Yet the essential features in the character of these elements can be determined by means of the first half.

Hollenberg,[2] in a thorough and meritorious investigation, was the first to treat the question with precision. He came to the conclusion that the Deuteronomic portions of the Book of Joshua were not written by D but by the editor (R^d), who united D to the rest of the Hexateuch, and, according to Hollenberg, also wrote Deut. i.-iv. and xxvii., xxix.-xxxi. Wellhausen substantially agrees with him.[3]

To say nothing of the impossibility of Deut. i.-iv. having been

[1] On both points *cf.* the thorough investigation in Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 26; also Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 440.

[2] *StKr.*, 1874, pp. 462-506.

[3] *JDTh.* xxi. p. 585 ff.

written by R^d, which we have already proved,[1] there are weighty arguments against such an editor having been the author of fragments so extensive. Granted that R^d in all probability altered his text much more largely and freely than R^h. But the author of these fragments went far beyond a mere editor's procedure and in some points contradicted it.[2] It may therefore be confidently held that in these Deuteronomic portions, as in others, R^d worked in accordance with sources which he deemed himself bound to respect.

Hence Kuenen[3] is right in claiming for these constituents an independent author who is to be distinguished from R^d. He discovers him in a D^2, who is closely connected with the author of Deut. i.-iv. and xxvii. ff. or in some writers of like character. Dillmann[4] starts with the same recognition of an independent authorship, but, in accordance with his position towards Deut. i.-iv. and xxvii. ff., he ascribes the ground-work of this Deuteronomic revision of the Book of Joshua to D himself. A number of signs lead him to the conclusion that at the very outset D not only provided his work with a historical Introduction but also furnished it with the same kind of conclusion, and that the latter was extended beyond the death of Moses so as to treat briefly of the events that happened under Joshua.

The possibility of this idea of Dillmann's can hardly be denied. But there seem to me to be many reasons which do not altogether recommend it in this form. No doubt we must allow that, in comparison with the main question as to whether R^d worked independently or used an already extant source, the other question as to whether this source is identical with D or with D^2 is but of subordinate importance. We have already recognised that Dillmann's hypothesis concerning Deut. i.-iv. is somewhat more probable than Kuenen's, and have admitted the entire justifi-

[1] P. 52.

[2] On individual contradictions between the Deuteronomic and other sections of the Book of Joshua, see especially Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 440.

[3] *Ond.*[2] § 7, Nos. 30, 31.

[4] *NuDtJo.*, pp. 440, 600.

ableness of the expectation that D himself would prefix to his work an Introduction explaining the events that happened between Horeb and the close of the law-giving. But we cannot pronounce the same judgment on the theory of a historical conclusion. Our reasons are as follows :—

(*a.*) Deuteronomy is not a history-book as the other books are. It did not contain any independent historical writing, not even after the brief fashion of P. When it had brought the reader to the point where Moses is speaking in the land of Moab it had effected all it deemed necessary. These passages do not contain an arbitrary decision concerning D's intentions, but are the result of the relation between the two historical narratives. That in Deut. i.-iv., as might be expected from its merely recapitulatory character, depends almost wholly on E (and J). The Deuteronomic source in Joshua is much less dependent on E and J. It is not a simple explanatory extract from those documents, but an independent work.

(*b.*) The effect which the Book of Kings assumes to have been produced by the reading of D culminates in Josiah's alarm at the grievous threatenings contained in the book. This result not only tells against the idea that the whole Pentateuch was read aloud, but it also decisively dissuades us from thinking that D closed with an extended narrative dealing with the history of Joshua. The overpowering effect which the book assuredly sought to produce, and did produce, might much more confidently be looked for if the curses formed its close.

(*c.*) It is true that subjective impressions may in part have caused the observation that the Deuteronomic author in Joshua attaches himself[1] more closely to Deut. i.-iv. and xxvii. ff. than to Deut. v.-xxvi. But it cannot altogether be denied that there are certain distinctions between D and those fragments in Joshua.[2] This

[1] Hollenberg, *StKr.*, 1874, p. 472 ff.

[2] *Cf.* Josh. i. 3-5, with Deut. xi. 24, and on this see Hollenberg, *ib.* p. 474 ; Wellhausen, xxi. p. 586 ; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 30 ; but also Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 443. On Josh. viii. 30-35 compared with Deut. xxvii. 1 ff., see Hollenberg, p. 479 f., and against him Kuenen, *ib.* ; Dillmann, p. 477 f.

is in favour of their having been written by an author (D^2) who worked in the manner and with the language of D.

It is difficult to say whether this D^2 is a distinct person from D^1 or the same person writing later to supplement his former work. The strong linguistic resemblance to D^1 is in favour of the latter view,[1] whilst the minor differences as to matters of fact speak for a distinct author. At all events the D^2 of Joshua arose from an attempt to work up the early post-Mosaic history given by the other documents by way of sequel to D and in D's manner and spirit. And in all probability D^1, when he composed D, saw no necessity as yet for taking this work in hand, though afterwards he himself or some other may have felt it incumbent on him to do so. The verdict on those Deuteronomic portions of Deut. xxvii. ff. which do not belong immediately to D himself, which was just now reserved, becomes self-evident. Originally they and D^2 formed the beginning of Joshua: it was R^d who placed them at the close of D.

§ 8. *The Sources J and E. Their Relation to each other and to D.*

If we leave aside Deuteronomy and the fragments related to it there remains within the Hexateuch almost the whole of the four first books, Genesis to Numbers, as well as a large part of the book of Joshua. By easily recognisable and long recognised signs the whole of this material is divided into two great main groups which may be designated in accordance with their most general character as the 'priestly' group and the 'prophetic.' We are here concerned with the latter. Formerly those elements in it which deviate from its prevalent character were assigned to the priestly group, and it was regarded as being otherwise a solid unity: this is not even admissible as a question now. The group divides into two principal writings.

The group which differs from the other sources that treat of the primitive history by using the divine name Yahvé from the very

[1] This is especially pressed by Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 440.

beginning onwards derives from this peculiarity the name Yahvistic Writing (J). The other, in relating the earliest history down to the time of Moses, employs throughout the designation Elohîm for God, and not seldom adheres to this even after the revelation of the name Yahvé.[1] Hence it is called the Elohistic Writing (E). Its author used to be called the 'later Elohist' to distinguish his work from the Priestly Writing (P) which adopts the same principle. But that was when P was almost universally admitted to be the 'Foundation Writing' of the Hexateuch. At the present day many prefer to call him the older Elohist, or, with a more correct brevity, the Elohist. Dillmann designates this writing by B and the Yahvistic by C. Herm. Schultz, on the contrary, uses B for the Yahvistic and C for the Elohistic.

1. *Relation to Deuteronomy.*—To obtain a probable starting-point from which to determine the age of these prophetic fragments it is desirable in the first place that we should fix our attention on them as a united whole and compare them with Deuteronomy, the age of which we now know.

The historical narrative of D (and of D^2 in case and in so far as such an author must be recognised) shows clearly the dependence of this writer on the prophetic account. When in the foundation part of Deuteronomy (chaps. v.-xxvi.) the older history is spoken of—this is specially the case in chaps. v., ix. and x.—it is reproduced with constant reference to that portion of the ancient tradition. In a number of instances a distinct verbal agreement can be perceived.[2] This necessitates our admitting the dependence of one of the representations on the other, and there can be no doubt on which side it lies. Useing for brevity's sake the symbol JE, which Wellhausen invented, we may say that in it we have a progressive narrative, flowing in two main streams, whereas in

[1] Dillmann, *NuDtJo.*, p. 617, maintains that this was the case everywhere, and that the name Yahvé in E, even after Ex. iii., always comes from editorial revision.

[2] *Cf.* Deut. v., ix., x. with Ex. xix.-xxiv., xxxii.-xxxiv., but especially Deut. ix. 9 with Ex. xxiv. 18, xxxiv. 28; Deut. ix. 10 with Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 16; Deut. ix. 12-14 with Ex. xxxii. 7-10, and many others.

D we have a hortatory recapitulation, frequently desultory, in some places giving a brief reference, in others a broad description. The Introduction, Deut. i.-iv., displays the same character on an even larger scale. And although its author diverges from JE in many points,[1] JE is the fountain from which he chiefly draws. The variations may have arisen partly from a free treatment of his material and partly from the use of other sources or other strata of tradition. At all events there is nothing to render questionable the dependence of this stratum also of the Deuteronomic narrative on JE.[2] The prophetic narrative is therefore older than Deuteronomy, and this is indeed universally admitted.[3]

Special interest attaches to another phenomenon, on which Dillmann[4] has recently laid stress, viz., the marked preference which Deuteronomy shows for E in its reproduction of the older narrative preserved in J and E. There can be no doubt that the author is acquainted with J and uses it as a source.[5] But he sticks far closer to E, and this in a manner which leads us to guess that he stood in a nearer relation to this source than to[6] J. This nearer relation could scarcely be explained on the supposition that the author had E and J before him as an already united whole.[7] The inference would rather seem to be that he possessed both books as independent writings and preferred E. There are also some special indications which point in the same direction.[8]

[1] See Wellh. *JDTh.* xxii. p. 469; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 610.

[2] *Cf.* especially Deut. i. 6-19 with Ex. xviii. 13-27 and Num. xi. 11-17, 24-29; Deut. ii. 2-23 with Num. xx. 14-23, xxi. 1 ff., etc.

[3] *Cf.* Graf, *Gesch. BB.*, p. 9 ff.; Kosters, *Die historie-beschouwing van den Deuteronomist*, etc. (1868); Kayser, *Vorexil Buch.*, p. 141 ff.; Wellh. *JDTh.* xxii. p. 465 ff.; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 9, No. 5; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 609.

[4] *NuDtJo.*, p. 609.

[5] *Cf.* Deut. ix. 9-x. 5, with Ex. xxxii.-xxxiv.; and Deut. i. 11, with Num. xi. 11, 17.

[6] Horeb, not Sinai, Deut. i. 2, and elsewhere. Amorites, not Canaanites, Deut. i. 7 and elsewhere. *Cf.* further the contents of the majority of the parallels.

[7] See Meyer, in *ZAW.*, i. p. 123. Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 242, holds that J and E were combined so as to form JE in the period between D^1 and D^2.

[8] See the observations in Dillmann, p. 609, respecting the date of what is related in Ex. xviii., and the relation between Num. xiii. f. and Deut. i. 20 ff.

If the history is older in J and E than in D, the same relation should hold good in the legal portions. In the case of the Decalogue, which is common to both books,[1] it must be admitted that both JE and D give the original contents with later additions;[2] and yet the formulation of the Ten Words in D presents a number of elements[3] not found in JE, which show decisively that the form in D is the later one.[4] In like manner E's Book of the Covenant[5] is in many ways used and consequently presupposed[6] in D's laws. This is especially true of the laws in Deut. xii.-xx.[7] The same relation is not quite so demonstrable in the section Deut. xxi.-xxv., but possibly exists there also.[8] It can be traced too in the first part of D, Deut. v.-xi.[9] On these points scholars are unanimous. With regard to that section of J which stands in the place of the Book of the Covenant,[10] and to some other historical sections[11] in this book, the same unanimity does not prevail. Dillmann[12] holds that D is dependent on them, while Kuenen[13] only admits this with considerable reserve. The disagreement arises from Kuenen's peculiar division of the documents in these passages. On that, of course, the decision of the question depends. Yet there can be no real doubt about this:—in so far as these laws actually belong to J, they are older than D; if some portions of them are to be assigned to a later editor (whom we should designate R^d), they may possibly depend on D.

2. *The Relation between E and J. Their Combination.*—Both writings, E and J, deal substantially with the same material.

[1] Ex. xx. 2-17, and Deut. v. 6-18.

[2] In Ex. xx. 10, 12. On Ex. xx. 11, contrasted with Deut. v. 14^b, 15, see Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 9, No. 2.

[3] See Deut. v. 12, 14, 16, 18.

[4] *Cf.* Graf, *Gesch. BB.*, p. 19 f.

[5] Ex. xx. 23-xxiii. 33.

[6] See Graf, *Gesch. BB.*, p. 21 ff.; Klein., *Das Deut.*, p. 47 ff.; Kayser, *Vorex. Buch.*, p. 136 f.; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 9, No. 3; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 604 f.

[7] See Graf, *ib.*; Kuen. *ib.*

[8] See Graf, *ib.* p. 24; Kuen., p. 161; Dillm., p. 604. Possibly D here builds on another older collection of laws.

[9] Graf, *ib.*, p. 20 f.

[10] Ex. xxxiv. 10-26.

[11] Ex. xiii. 3-6; xii. 21-27.

[12] *NuDtJo.*, p. 605.

[13] *Ond.*[2] § 9, No. 4. According to § 13, Nos. 21, 29, they belong in part to the seventh century, and in part to the end of the seventh or beginning of the sixth.

They relate the history of the holy people from the remotest times to the settlement in Canaan. Both preface[1] this history of Israel with a recital of the earliest history of mankind down to Abraham. We still possess this Introduction by J; whether we have remnants of E's is not certain.[2] It is easy to understand how this sameness of material, and the similarity of treatment to which both authors have in many respects subjected it, has prompted the inquiry whether one of these writings was not composed with an eye to and an actual use of the other. This is a topic which would naturally form the close of our discussion of J and E. But we must deal with it here, because our decision as to the reciprocal relation of the two sources may possibly involve our verdict on their age.

Nöldeke has answered the question with an uncompromising affirmative.[3] He believes he can prove, not only that J was acquainted with and made use of E, but that he directly incorporated E's book into his own and blended the two. Wellhausen[4] emphatically opposes him. He undertakes to prove that J and E diverge from each other in such a way as to make it impossible to believe that either writer welded the other's work with his own. And it must be admitted that he makes out his case. He is, for example, fully justified in saying of Gen. xx. ff., that on Nöldeke's supposition J 'would have been compelled to adjust and accommodate to the foreign elements he was adopting a narrative of his own which, as author and originator, he could shape at his will; but his procedure was just the opposite.'[5] The same observation can be made at other points in the narrative, where we can still see that the two sources are combined.[6] Perhaps the clearest instance of it in Genesis is the history of Joseph, where the discrepant statements stand in such immediate juxtaposition and conflict so severely with each other as to demonstrate at once the

[1] Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 617.
[2] See below, § 12.
[3] *Unters. z. Kritik. d. AT.*, p. 3 f. 23.
[4] *JDTh.* xxi. p. 406 ff., 419, 440, 450.
[5] *JDTh.* xxi. p. 406.
[6] *e.g.* in Gen. xxviii. ff.

untenableness of this view, which for a time was very popular.[1] In the Book of Exodus, I specially mention the history of the events at Sinai, Ex. xix. ff., where the same result again comes out with all possible clearness.[2] From all these facts we must conclude that the combination of J and E was not the work of either of the original authors, but of a third person. He must have stood in so entirely objective a position with regard to the two frequently contradictory sources that both of them seemed to him equally precious and his one concern, as editor, was to unite them in an acceptable manner, without omitting any more of either than was absolutely necessary.

It is therefore safe to hold that J and E at one time existed as separate compositions, though this does not involve the admission that their authors planned and shaped them independently. But here agreement ceases. How the two writings were combined by a third hand, and what, more precisely, was their reciprocal relation is still disputable. Wellhausen was the first to give a detailed proof of the combination of J and E by a third hand, and he imagines that this reviser lived not very long after the composition of the second source which he used, but prior to Deuteronomy. It is true, this man was already, he thinks, influenced by the spirit of Deuteronomy.[3] As the one in whom J and E are brought together, Wellhausen names him JE. He founds the idea of there having been such a JE on what he deems the fact that all through the Hexateuch, J and E stand in a much closer relation to each other than to P, so that, in his opinion, the reviser who incorporated P into our present Hexateuch, cannot have been the first to join J and E together, and at the same time join them with P.[4] Dillmann[5] declares his assent to the idea of an independent authorship, but opposes the distinction between JE and

[1] Gen. xxxvii. 39 ff. On this see Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 1, No. 26.

[2] Compare the analysis of the events at Sinai in §§ 20 and 21 : it will then be impossible to doubt the untenableness of this idea.

[3] *JDTh.* xxi. p. 564 ; *Gesch. Isr.*[1] p. 372.

[4] *JDTh.* xxi. pp. 425, 440, 564 ; Bleek-Wellhausen, *Einl.*[4] p. 178.

[5] *Gen.*[5] p. xviii. *NuDtJo.*, p. 677 f.

R. He believes the closer connection of R with J and E than with P to be explicable from internal reasons: he also finds instances where R has united J or E more intimately with P.

The decision of this question depends in part very materially on the dating of P. Yet there are some points of view which can be vindicated apart from this. It is in the Book of Joshua that the reader is most struck by the extraordinarily close welding together of the two writings, J and E, which in many cases looks more like the work of a writer who freely remoulds his materials than of a mere editor. The portions from J and E and those from D are there woven together by a hand which makes weighty alterations and not seldom narrates with perfect freedom.[1] It seems to me that, at least for the Book of Joshua, it can be made probable that this Deuteronomic editor (R^d)—the same who retouched D (or D^2) and united it with J and E—is also to be identified with the one who blended J and E together. This view is strongly supported by the additional fact that D himself, both in what is acknowledged to be the kernel of his work and in Deut. i.-iv. (D^2?), does not convey the impression of having been acquainted with J and E in the form of Wellhausen's JE, that is, as a connected unity. D attaches himself, in the most striking manner, almost exclusively to the narrative in E[2], ignoring almost entirely that of J. It is this especially[3] which makes it probable that he had not the united JE to work from, but used E as his favourite source, and whilst employing J also, regarded the latter as of only secondary value. In many instances it is simply inconceivable how D could have detached E's account from an already united whole and left J on one side.

It is consequently more than probable than J and E were connected with each other after the publication of Deuteronomy. But if so, and if Wellhausen admits so close a relationship between JE and D that formerly it even seemed to him doubtful[4] whether JE should be distinguished from the Deuteronomic

[1] *Cf.* Josh. i. f., iii. f., chap. vi. and others.
[2] See above, No. 1.
[3] See also Meyer, *ZA W.* i. p. 123, n.
[4] *Gesch. Isr.*[1] p. 372.

reviser, I can see no reason for believing in a JE distinct from R^d. The belief in JE's existence is principally due to the idea that J and E were joined together before Deuteronomy appeared, though Kuenen adheres to the belief without maintaining this idea. If it does not hold good it will not be too much to ascribe to R^d the joining of J and E and the addition thereto of D and—if we must distinguish—of D^2. Perhaps Dillmann might be able to fall in with this solution rather than with Wellhausen's. For it cannot well be denied that there are traces of R^d in Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, although they are less frequent than in Joshua. If another hand than the latest R (whom I designate R^h because he formed our present Hexateuch out of the sources) has been at work, and if again the mutual connection of J and E or of J, E, and D is much closer than their connection with P, an independent working up of these sources will have to be reckoned amongst the possibilities.

3. *Priority.*—It is even more difficult to answer the question, 'Which of the two sources, J or E, is the earlier?' Opinions on this point are diametrically opposed, and the reasons alleged on both sides are not so convincing as to allow of our accepting them without further inquiry.

The difficulty of arriving at a decisive verdict is increased by the circumstance that neither of the sources J and E is strictly homogeneous. However true it may be as a general statement that each of them is a finished whole, yet in J as well as E there are unmistakable instances where the present state of the writing seems to evince the workmanship of another, and, for the most part, later hand. Budde[1] especially, following Wellhausen's suggestions, has sought to prove this of J. In the primæval history, at all events, he has distinguished from J himself (J^1), a later Yahvistic source (J^2), and a Yahvistic editor (J^3), who joined the other two. Kuenen[2] objects to J^3 but agrees with the remaining important points of Budde's analysis. And Kuenen himself has conjectured a series of later additions to E. We shall

[1] Budde, *Die bibl. Urgeschichte*, 1883. [2] *Theol. Tijdschr.* xviii. p. 121 ff.

have to state more precisely our position in respect to Budde's results on Gen. i.-xi. when we come to treat of the connexion of the writing J. In the same volume he maintains the possible co-operation of another hand in certain other passages, *e.g.* Ex. iv. and Num. xxiii. f. Our view of Kuenen's conjectures finds expression more than once when we treat of E, § 21.

But even where a later hand, a J^2 and E^2, can be recognised in the present condition of the writing J and E, the question remains whether we have a later addition or merely a later embellishment of a piece originally from J and E. The latter is far more probable, seeing that in cases where the historical, and especially the linguistic, characteristics of a source are maintained, later additions always arouse suspicion.

Nöldeke's opinion, stated above, as to the manner in which J and E were united is self-evidently connected with the assumption that E is older than J. This used to be generally held, and Schrader and Kayser continue to maintain it. Wellhausen has recently opposed it. His opinion has been adopted by a number of other investigators, H. Schultz,[1] Meyer,[2] Stade,[3] Kuenen, etc.

The reasons alleged by Wellhausen[4] in support of his view are these:—

(*a.*) J is least touched by the specifically prophetic spirit, whereas E exhibits a more developed and more theoretical religiousness. This is shown by E's view of the golden calf, the representation of Abraham as a Nabî, etc.

(*b.*) A more primitive conception of the deity is found in J: He draws near to men in bodily form. In E God calls from heaven or reveals himself in dreams.

(*c.*) Events which in J are thought of as resulting from natural causes are referred to the operation of God in E.

[1] *Alttest. Theol.*[2] p. 58 (English Translation, p. 67).

[2] *ZA W.* i. pp. 132, 141 ff. [3] *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 58.

[4] Especially *Gesch. Isr.*, p. 370 ff. So far as I can see the exposition here given is not repeated in the Prolegomena, but Wellhausen has nowhere explained that it no longer corresponds to his views. (But *cf. Prol.*[3] 377. At all events Kuenen has adopted it as his own—see next page.)

(*d.*) E is nearer than J to Deuteronomy and the Priests' Code.

(*e.*) The comparison of individual parallel passages in J and E shows that E depends on J. Gen. xx. compared with Gen. xxvi. 6-11 is the most instructive on this point.

Kuenen has expressed his concurrence with these reasons of Wellhausen's. But he has conceded, on the one hand, that the comparison of the parallel narratives does not of itself lead to a perfectly certain result.[1] And on the other hand, he has decisively repudiated the unduly far-going conclusions which Ed. Meyer,[2] and after him Stade,[3] have built on the assumption of J's priority to E.[4] The fact is that a literary dependence of E on J cannot be really proved either by the examples on which Wellhausen lays stress[5] or by those which Kuenen adduces.[6] And if some of them appear to exhibit an earlier shape of the narrative matter in J, there can be set against them at least as many and more weighty examples of the dependence of J on E. Especially does the history of Joseph in E convey throughout the impression that we have in it the more original version, that in J being an elaboration. It seems also to me that Dillmann[7] is right in making the same assertion concerning the beginning of the history of Moses, Ex. i.-v. And two narratives of such critical importance must be allowed to be more weighty than detached smaller portions.

The further reasons adduced by Wellhausen are not so cogent as they would have been if the parallel narratives had furnished an absolutely certain demonstration of the greater antiquity of either document. So far as they correspond with the actual state of facts they can be satisfactorily explained in another way. Dillmann[8] has recently urged this quite justifiably.

[1] *Ond.* § 13, No. 11. [2] *ib.* [3] *Gesch. d. V. Israel*, i. p. 113 ff.

[4] *Theol. Tijdsch.* xviii. p. 516 ff. *Ond.*[2] § 13, Nos. 13, 14. *Cf.* also Meyer's reply, *ZA W.* v. p. 36 ff.

[5] On the parallelism between Gen. xx. and xxvi. 6 ff., see below, §13, from which it appears that this does not prove E's dependence on J. On the golden calf, see §§ 20, 21.

[6] Gen. xvi. 1 f., 3-14 contrasted with xxi. 22-31; xxx. 28-43 contrasted with xxxi. 4-13, etc. [7] *NuDtJo.*, p. 628. [8] *NuDtJo.*, p. 630 f.

Dillmann unreservedly admits that especially from the time of Moses downwards J possesses many extremely antique narratives and statements, so that in many cases more credence is due to him than to the accounts of E and D which the editor has preferred. But in this he can only see an indication that J had at his disposal other and, in part, better sources for the times of Moses and Joshua than E. The latter point is in some instances indisputable; in others E was beyond all question able to avail himself of more exact[1] and ancient[2] information.

With regard to Welhausen's reasons, *b.* and *c.*, Dillmann fully admits the facts. It is true that E displays more inclination than J to emphasise the supernatural and shrinks somewhat from anthropomorphic views of God.[3] But why should a later date be deduced from this distinctive mode of thought? We must acknowledge that in this Dillmann is right. The tracing an event back to divine interposition, coupled with a comparative putting into the background of natural second causes, is no proof of the author's lack of acquaintance with the latter: it only shows the greater importance of the former to his religiously disposed mind. Perhaps we may bring forward as an analogy the relation in which the Greek historians Herodotus and Thucydides stood to each other. It is Herodotus, the earlier writer and the one who tells his story naïvely, who everywhere lays stress on the divine action, in contrast with Thucydides, who points to the human causes. Ought the same peculiarity in E to be taken as a sign of later date?

[1] *Cf.* his names, such as Eliezer, Deborah, Potiphar, Pithom, Puah, Shiphrah, (Gen. xv. 2; xxxv. 8; xxxvii. 36; Ex. i. 11, 15; xvii. 12; xxiv. 14.) Data concerning ancient burial-places, altars, and the like, such as Gen. xxxi. 8, 19, f.; Josh. xxiv. 30, 32, 33; Gen. xxxiii. 19 f.; xxviii. 18 f. (maççeba); Josh. iv. 9; v. 3 (?); xxiv. 26; Num. xxi. 9.

[2] If we are unable to credit E with the invention of the many names and facts which he gives us, still less can we ascribe to this cause the multifarious statements and expressions which have an antique appearance, *e.g.* Gen. xv. 2; xx. 16, or such notices as Gen. xxxi. 19 ff; xxxv. 2 ff. (Aramaic origin of the teraphim); Ex. xv. 22 ff.; Josh. xxiv. 26; on which see Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 619 f.

[3] Yet on the whole there are but few instances in which E. gives the supernatural and J the natural view (see Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 611, top), whereas elsewhere J, as well as E, holds to the faith in divine interposition.

And J's strong inclination to speak of God anthropomorphically, especially when the many anthropomorphisms of the prophets are considered, is far less a proof of his greater antiquity than of the fact that his modes of thought and speech, though penetrated with religious and ethical convictions, were such as belonged to the populace, but not so steeped in theological reflection. To the same peculiarity may be traced his carrying back the worship of Yahvé into the remotest antiquity, unless, as Dillmann prefers to think,[1] this is due to a deliberate purpose.[2]

But when Wellhausen (see *a.* and *d.* above) finds E to be in closer contact than J with the specifically prophetic spirit and consequently deems it nearer to Deuteronomy, this arises, at any rate in part, from his altogether peculiar analysis of J, an analysis which, again, is based on this character assigned to J by him. In a number of passages, which might quite well belong to J so far as their contents and form are concerned, Wellhausen and, after him, the critics who have adopted his view, have denied J's authorship and ascribed them to JE, solely because they bear a stronger resemblance to prophetic language. However true it may be that the older sources stand under the influence of a Deuteronomic revision, there is nothing to justify our eliminating from J all the passages that accord with this revision and thus making of J a source entirely untouched by the prophetic spirit. This it is as little as E, in fact almost less.

The correctness of this proposition, and therefore the incorrectness of that critical thesis which is based on the purely 'pre-prophetic' character of J, is quite clear from the passages which are allowed to belong to J. The whole structure and circle of thoughts belonging to this source in Genesis might far better be termed prophetic than pre-prophetic. The way and manner in which J speaks of the origin and spread of sin in the world,[3] of the call of Abraham and Israel's mission of salvation amongst

[1] *NuDtJo.*, p. 631.

[2] *Cf.* such passages as Gen. iv. 26; xii. 7 f; xiii. 4; xxi. 33; xxvi. 25.

[3] Gen. ii.-iv.; viii. 1-6, 21; ix. 22 ff.; xi. 1 ff.; xix. 1 ff.

the nations,[1] of faith and the divine decree,[2] and many other things,[3] is proof enough of this. If it is remembered that although prophetic ideas are by no means absent from E, yet they do not pervade the whole book to the same extent, it will be evident that, looked at from this side also, J cannot be set down as earlier than E. On the ground of their relation to each other the question as to the respective ages of the two sources at any rate cannot be answered in Wellhausen's sense. And if the manifold similarities of their contents appear to exclude that possibility of their being independent writings, which the results hitherto obtained might perhaps have allowed us to think of, we must decide in favour of E's originality rather than of J's. This somewhat indefinite preliminary result will be established in a more definite form when we have taken into account the remaining elements of the problem, particularly the origin of the two writings.

4. *Age and Origin.*—In contrast with this preliminary result, which excludes one opinion rather than asserts the opposite, it is desirable now to enter directly on the investigation of the age of J and E, without seeking help from the comparison of the two sources.

If it is once established that J and E are older than D, the first starting-point from which to date back the two writings will have to be sought in the prophets who committed their message to writing. The earliest prophets of this kind who can be certainly determined are Amos and Hosea, in the beginning of the eighth century. Comparison leads to the conclusion that our two writings are earlier than these two prophets. On general grounds it might have been expected that historical literature would precede prophetic. Moreover, the prophetic tone and the mode of speech in Amos, and especially in Hosea, unmistakably exhibit a more advanced stage of prophecy than these prophetical

[1] Gen. xii. 1-3; xxiv. 7; xviii. 18 f.; xxvii. 29 f.; Num. xxiv. 9.

[2] Gen. xv. 6; Ex. iv. 1, 5, 8 f.; xiv. 31; Gen. iii. 15; v. 29; viii. 21; ix. 25-27; xii. 2 f.; xviii. 18 f.; xxviii. 14; Num. xxiv. 17 f.

[3] See Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 629, in so far as the passages there cited belong to J according to our analysis in §§ 13 and 20.

portions of the Torah. This is indeed rather to be felt than to be strictly proved. But no one who, for example, reads Hosea a while and then turns to J or E will be able to resist the impression.[1] Finally, Amos as well as Hosea contains references to the earlier history of the people which is treated in J and E. By far the simplest explanations of them is that which takes them to be quotations from writings already in existence, especially seeing that they are larger in extent than might have been expected. It is, indeed, difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to produce a convincing proof that a written document lies at the base of a historical allusion when the author has not specifically named the source from which he is quoting. But the very fact that in these prophets there is a frequent reference to the history shows that the historical impulse had been awakened in the consciousness of the people. We might almost anticipate that if this impulse had not already found satisfaction, Amos and Hosea would have needed to put their allusions differently, and, in fact, to make them fuller. They would not have been at liberty to take things for granted, but would have been compelled to narrate.

If Amos and Hosea confine themselves to allusions, the allusions are in consequence all the more numerous. Hosea touches on Israel's trangression with Baal Peor,[2] the circumstances attending the birth of Jacob,[3] the Patriarch's struggle with God,[4] his flight to Mesopotamia and fortunes there.[5] He calls Moses a prophet,[6] as E delights to designate him. Amos mentions the character of Esau.[7] He calls the Canaanite aborigines Amorites,[8] as E is accustomed to do. Like the History of the Spies he recognises the Amorites as a strong and gigantic race.[9] He calls to mind the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah.[10] Many of these co-

[1] Note such ideas as 'whoring,' the rejection of the high places, and the like.
[2] Hos. ix. 10; *cf.* Num. xxv. 3 (E).
[3] Hos. xii. 4*a*; *cf.* Gen. xxv. 26*a* (E).
[4] Hos. xii. 4*b*, 5; *cf.* Gen. xxxii. 25 ff. (J).
[5] Hos. xii. 13; *cf.* Gen. xxxi. 41 (E); xxvii. 43 (J and E); xxix. 18 ff. (E).
[6] Hos. xii. 14.
[7] Am. i. 11; *cf.* Gen. xxvii. 40 (J and E).
[8] Am. ii. 10.
[9] Am. ii. 9; *cf.* Num. xiii. 27 ff. (J and E).
[10] Am. iv. 11; *cf.* Gen. xix. 25 (J).

incidences would have no weight if they stood alone. Each of them contributes to the proof when taken along with the others. For myself it is a strong confirmation of my opinion that I completed the analysis of sources which is presupposed in the notes without any reference to these passages in the prophets.[1]

The year 800, or probably a few years, if not a few decades, earlier, must therefore be regarded as the latest date at which the two writings can have been composed. The writing J actually brings us to this period, as is evident when we ascertain the quarter whence it came.

The kingdom of Judah was obviously its native country. If we compare the history of Joseph given by this source with that in E, the fact that Reuben stands at the head of the brethren in E and Judah in J,[2] forces itself on us as one of the weightiest differences. The history of Joseph could always be applied to the glorification of the northern tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh, and it clearly betrays its north Israelitish origin: yet in the form found in J it has passed through a Judæan hand. That is the only possible meaning of Judah's exaltation. The same is expressed by the Blessing of Jacob which J has handed down, with its glorification of Judah and his kingdom, and its harsh reproof of Reuben.[3] In like manner it will be more correct to designate Gen. xxxviii. as a Judæan tribal history, written expressly in favour of Judah, than to see in it a bitter mock at Judah.[4] It is also significant that in J Abraham's fixed abode is[5] at the ancient Judæan capital, Hebron,[6] whereas, according to E, he prefers to live in the Negeb, the district of Beersheba,[7] a sanctuary which the

[1] Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] p. 221, will not admit any reference to E but only to J: Dillmann, *NuDtJo.*, p. 630, cannot see any acquaintance with J, but only with E. I cannot assent to either view.

[2] Gen. xxxvii. 26 ff.; xliii. 3 ff.; xliv. 16 ff.; xlvi. 28.

[3] Gen. xlix. 3 f., 8 ff. [4] See Reuss, *Gesch. d. H. Schr. d. AT.*, p. 250.

[5] Gen. xiii. 18; xviii. 1.

[6] In like manner as in the Priestly Writing, which is also Judæan.

[7] It is to be observed that J also makes Abraham dwell for a time in Bethel, Shechem, and the south, just as, according to E, he stays temporarily in Hebron (see below, §§ 12 and 13).

northern Israelites also held in honour. Again, Balaam's speeches in J clearly make reference to the kingdom of David.[1] And, finally,[2] although E also probably did not pass over in silence the transgression of Israel with the golden calf, it is J who relates it in special detail and rebukes it with special acerbity.[3]

This demonstration that not a few of the narratives in J have been revised in a Judæan sense renders the Judæan derivation of the document certain. We may be allowed to assume here that we possess parallel narratives of Joseph and Abraham from the Israelite point of view. Now that J's home has been determined it will probably be possible to form a more detailed judgment as to the relation between the two sources than was possible before. To put into shape and writing the history of Joseph was the first and most natural motive amongst the northern tribes, because the very subject-matter of the history served to glorify the northern kingdom. We should expect beforehand that it would be written first in the north, and not by J in the south. But apart from this Reuben is the firstborn of the sons of Jacob. To set him at the head of the brethren is the natural and intrinsically fitting procedure. Judah's primacy is of later date, of gradual growth, and never recognised without dispute. Clearly the Israelite form of E is the original, and that in J a calculated remodelling in accordance with Judæan ideas. The same applies to the history of Abraham.[4] Now that we know the form narrated in J to be the Judæan one, the patriarch's settlement at Hebron seems to contain a later development. E also is no doubt acquainted with Hebron as an abode of Abraham's, but he ascribes no importance to it. J alone lays stress on Hebron, but knows also the other places.[5] Abraham's abode in the centre and the south of the land is common to both sources, and seems therefore to be the

[1] Num. xxiv. 17.

[2] To those who regard Judges i. as a part of J the preference given to Judah in that chapter will be another proof.

[3] Ex. xxxii. For greater detail see §§ 20 and 21.

[4] Against Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 7.

[5] See above, p. 83, Note 7.

original idea, whereas the stress laid on Hebron is a later development.[1]

The reasons mentioned above make it impossible to assert that J originated in northern Israel.[2] Single words pointing to a northern origin[3] do not prove a great deal. After what has been said we need occupy ourselves no further with the history of Joseph and Abraham. And the fact that J as well as E holds the north Israelite sanctuaries in honour[4] only shows that in his day the temple at Jerusalem had not yet won such paramount importance as to prevent writers and readers in Judah from recognising the holiness of those places of sacrifices which were still common to the entire people. It seems to us an unnecessary complication of the problem when Kuenen[5] seeks to explain the character of J (and E) by the hypothesis of a double 'edition' of each source, first an Israelite, and secondly a Judæan. E has no double character: in J it is explained far more simply by that dependence of J and E which we have now ascertained.

We are thus enabled to determine the author's period a little more exactly. However near he stands, when judged by his other leading ideas, to the new phase of prophecy represented by Amos and Hosea, he estimates the ancient sanctuaries quite differently from those prophets.[6] This confirms the conjecture we have already made that we must cross the threshold of the eighth century into the close of the ninth. We are hindered from going

[1] There is, in any case, just as much intrinsic fitness in thinking of Abraham in connection with Shechem and Beersheba as with Hebron. From this point of view also we have therefore no right to think of Abraham as a peculiarly Judæan figure.

[2] Schrader, Reuss, and Kuenen assert it.

[3] Schrader, *Einl.*[8] p. 322 f. On the other side see Dillmann, *NuDtJo.*, p. 627.

[4] Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 7, and p. 223.

[5] *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 25.

[6] Dillmann, *NuDtJo.*, disputes this and consequently holds it possible to go earlier than Hezekiah. But according to Am. iii. 14; iv. 4; v. 5, viii. 14; and Hos. iv. 15; ix. 15; x. 5, 15, it would have been impossible to write then about Bethel and Beersheba in such terms as Gen. xii. 8, xxviii. 16, 13 ff., xxi. 33 (xxvi. 23 J?): at all events a man of prophetic spirit could not have done it even if he had laid stress on the statement that it was Yahvé who was worshipped there.

further back by the markedly prophetic spirit, by J's dependence in many points on E, which by this time has become highly probable, and by the fact that the Assyrian Empire already stands out so prominently before the author's eyes.[1] This points to the second half of the ninth century. Within it we may probably go as far back as the last decades (830-800). There is no necessity to go further. For it is not certain that Josh. vi. 26, as it now stands, came from J: under no circumstances need the passage be a *vaticinium post eventum*.[2] In like manner, if the last speeches of Balaam come from J and are not rather to be regarded as later additions,[3] they might easily have been written under the influence of that universal consciousness of the threatening hostility of Assyria for which there was such abundant reason from 850 downwards.

E carries us a few decades further back. We have not found it proved above that the narratives belonging to this source evince dependence on J. In fact we have seen the contrary demonstrated in some instances. If our former assumption is now really vindicated and E's home is to be sought in the northern kingdom, the probability of its being the older source of the two is thus enhanced.

The north-Israelite origin of E may be regarded as certain.[4] For only the northern kingdom can have been the true place for the composition of the early Hebrew history. Here the vigorous pulsations of national life were felt in the first centuries after the division of the kingdom, and, to a great extent, previously thereto. Here, doubtless, those narratives of Jacob, Israel, and Joseph, of Abraham too and Isaac, of Moses and Joshua, took shape. If J has been shown to be their Judæan form, E, for this very reason, must be the Ephraimite. Here in Ephraim the majority of them were probably first moulded into that definite shape which found

[1] Gen. x. 8-12; xi. 1 ff.

[2] So Reuss, *Gesch. d. H. Schr.*, p. 250: see another explanation in Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 15.

[3] Which in any case must be admitted of Num. xxiv. 23 f.

[4] On this see especially Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 223 ff.

general acceptance, and, with a few modifications, was adopted by J.[1]

To these considerations must be added the specifically Ephraimite character of the narrative in E, which comes out in the histories of Joseph[2] and Abraham,[3] and in the close connection of the tradition with those ancient sanctuaries which specially belong to the northern kingdom, Bethel, Shechem, Gilgal, Ebal, Mahanaim and Penuel. Moreover the Ephraimite origin of E is specially indicated by the following facts: it distinctly mentions Bethel as the place whither the tithes are brought to Yahvé;[4] in the Blessing of Jacob, Joseph, with his sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, are distinguished in a very remarkable way;[5] finally, the author takes pleasure in noting the existence of the grave of one of the famous personages of the heroic age, a Joseph, Joshua, Eleazar, Deborah or Rachel, when the spot is pointed out in the northern realm.[6]

These results require a different date for E from that obtained by Wellhausen,[7] Kuenen,[8] and Stade.[9] The lower limit in this case also is supplied by Amos and Hosea. And according to the highly probable conclusions we have reached concerning the relations between E and J we must go higher than J's appearance. To say nothing about the quotations found in those prophets, we have already seen that the high esteem which J has no hesitation

[1] It is but in a comparatively small number of instances that J has an independent and discrepant account of what happened. Hence it is quite easy to understand why the attempt recently made (Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 9) to prove that J is the older of the two sources, was supported first of all by an attempt to prove its Ephraimite origin. Only thus is there any prospect of securing belief in its priority. But that proof will always be questioned, owing to the distinctly Judæan character of J.

[2] *Cf.* Gen. xxxvii. 22, 29, xlii. 22, 37. Reuben here stands at the head of the brethren.

[3] See above, p. 83. Compared with the districts of Shechem and Beersheba the part which Hebron plays in E is a merely subordinate one.

[4] Gen. xxviii. 22.

[5] Gen. xlviii. 8 ff., a narrative which J also may probably have been in possession of, but it can hardly have originated in Judah.

[6] Josh. xxiv. 32; Josh. xxiv. 30, 33; Gen. xxxv. 8, 19 f.

[7] *Gesch. Isr.*[1] p. 371 ff.

[8] *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 24.

[9] *Gesch. d. Volks. Israel*, i. p. 59.

in testifying for the ancient local sanctuaries puts him earlier than Amos and Hosea. This is the case with E to an even greater extent. In a much less forced and more natural manner than J does E mention and treat as holy such ancient spots as Bethel,[1] Beersheba,[2] Shechem,[3] and Gilgal,[4] with their altars, maççebas, holy stones, and trees. A desecration of them by idolatrous worship is nowhere intimated, not even in the incidental fashion which is thought to occur in J.[5]

Looked at from this side also E precedes J. With this it agrees that E gives no hint of that depression or decay of the kingdom of Israel which began after Jeroboam II.'s day. Such a blossoming forth of the writing of the nation's history as E exhibits implies a period of prosperity and dominion. And although, roughly speaking, there are no political allusions, the whole tone of E bears witness to a certain satisfaction of the national consciousness and joy over what has been won.[6] This joy over the present state of affairs finds a very high-pitched expression in the speeches of Balaam given by E.[7]

This brings us considerably beyond Jeroboam II., and consequently, in any case, within the ninth century. Taking account of the prophetical spirit of the book, Dillmann has therefore suggested that E dates from the period of Elijah and Elisha, the first half of the ninth century.[8] It will be necessary to go at least so far back. Nay, if it is a characteristic of this author that he knows the cultus of the high places in a form which is manifestly free from idolatry,[9] we might be inclined to go some distance beyond

[1] Gen. xxviii. 18 f.; xxxi. 13; xxxv. 7. [2] Gen. xxi. 31 f.; xlvi. 1 f.
[3] Gen. xxxiii. 19 f.; xxxv. 4 (E.?); Josh. xxiv. 26. [4] Josh. v. 3.
[5] Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 630, end of No. 5.
[6] No conclusion can be drawn from Gen. xxvii. 40, for the words which express a deliverance of Edom may very well be a later addition. If that is not the case, and if—which also is uncertain—the words belong to E, we shall be brought down to the period after Joram.
[7] Num. xxiii. 9 ff., 21 ff. [8] *NuDtJo.*, p. 621.
[9] We speak here of officially recognised idolatry conducted on a large scale. As a matter of course there were at all times isolated instances of lapse into heathen nature-worship.

Elijah, to the beginning of the ninth century (*circa* 900).[1] If E had written subsequently to the stern fight which Elijah waged against the desecration of Yahvé's service by the intermixture of Baal-worship, he would have felt obliged to express himself more carefully, for he was a sympathiser with the ideas of the prophets. If, on the other hand, the warning against strange gods,[2] which may be detected once or twice in E, should be referred to Elijah's war against Baal, we might very easily suppose the author to be a contemporary of Elijah or Elisha. But this is uncertain.

When we have once acknowledged E to be a comparatively ancient author it can scarcely be doubted that he belonged approximately to the age and circle of those prophets. We shall not be able in any case to go further back than Solomon and the Division of the Kingdom.[3] The structure of E's narrative is not stamped with the prophetic, didactic spirit,[4] in the same way as J's, yet his religious view of the world is rich in thoughts which could only have had vitality in genuinely prophetic circles. He prizes divine revelation highly,[5] looking on it as communicated in dreams. He knows of God's plan of grace for the salvation of man.[6] Nay, he expressly calls Abraham a prophet,[7] and treats Moses entirely as such.[8]

For it also corresponds with this that he decidedly condemns the adoration of Yahvé at Bethel and Dan under the image of a bull. I cannot think Dillmann[9] justified in holding it impossible for a north-Israelite prophet to have framed the protest in Ex. xxxii. against Jeroboam's bull-worship. This would be im-

[1] Schrader, *Einl.*[8] p. 318, wishes to go as far back as 975-950, whereas Böhmer, *Das 1 Buch. der Thora*, p. 119 f., comes as low as Jeroboam II.

[2] Josh. xxiv. 14 ff., Gen. xxxv. 2-4, the latter not quite proved to belong to E.

[3] See, for instance, Deut. xxxiii. 7, words which must be referred to the Division of the Kingdom (*cf.* Wellh. *Prol.*[2] p. 296, Eng. Trans. p. 275; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 177; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 420). And note, in general, what falls to be said later, on the age of the *Sepher ha-Yashâr* and the other sources of E.

[4] The only place where this comes out more strongly is the history of Joseph.

[5] Gen. xv. 1 ff.; xx. 6 (xxi. 12 xxii. 1); xxviii. 11 f.; xxxi. 10 f., 24, 29; xxxvii. 6 ff.; xl. f.; Num. xxii. 8 ff. [6] Gen. l. 20. [7] Gen. xx. 7.

[8] Deut. xxxiii. 1; Josh. xiv. 6, *cf.* Ex. iii.; xxxiii. 7 ff.; Num. xii.

[9] *ExLev.*, p. 322; but see also *NuDtJo.*, p. 627.

possible only on the supposition either of his not feeling the apostasy involved in the worship or not daring to assert it. There is no ground for believing either. Consequently, if the analysis of sources suggests that E contributed to the narrative of the golden calf, we have no right to deny it on *a priori* grounds. So much the less does such a right exist seeing that the prohibition of images by the Decalogue,[1] if E did not find it already extant, is due to himself. The man who knew or wrote this prohibition could not but oppose Jeroboam's bull-image, although, as a north-Israelite, he would do it more gently than the Judæan J.

5. *Sources of E and J.*—In forming a historical estimate of the two writings E and J, it would be of the utmost importance if we could obtain more exact information as to the sources whence their authors drew. Certain as is the fact that such sources, probably even in documentary form to some extent, lay before E as well as J, there is not much more to be made out with certainty about them. Many discrepancies within J and E, which are now summarily adjudged to be later additions to E and J, might be satisfactorily explained in this way, if we knew more about the documents they made use of. We are in a better position as to E than as to J. The case with regard to it is comparatively clear. In some cases E several times expressly mentions more ancient sources; in some, they manifest their presence in another distinctly recognisable fashion. And this may also be taken as a further incidental proof that E is older than J. For we cannot fairly ascribe to such a writer as E the tendency to feign that he is using older sources. We are acquainted with at least two writings which E directly appeals to as sources from which he has drawn, *The Book of the Wars of Yahvé*[2] and *The Sepher ha-Yashâr*.[3]

We must undoubtedly regard the former as an ancient book of songs in honour of the heroic age of Israel and its fights. Ed. Meyer[4] and Stade[5] are certainly wrong in asserting that the

[1] Ex. xx. 4.
[2] Num. xxi. 14 f., and probably 27 ff.
[3] Josh. x. 12 f.
[4] *ZAW.* i. p. 130 f.
[5] *ZAW.* i. p. 146; *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* i. pp. 50, 117 f.

conflicts of the heroic age which it depicts are not those of the period of the conquest of the country but Israel's wars with the neighbouring tribes in the ninth century. Our determination of the date of E is of itself sufficient to make this idea impossible to us. But apart from this, even if we accepted a comparatively late date for the composition of E, the hypothesis in question implies such a confusion of historical ideas in Israel as is wholly inconceivable. In that case E must either have shared in this confusion or have assumed it in his readers and availed himself of it. Consequently he must have made songs refer to ancient times which had been composed with reference to a period that lay so short a while before his own. This is a process for which, leaving all other considerations aside, a much longer interval is required than that of about a century, which is supposed to separate E from the Songs.[1] But E's readers must also have known that Book of Songs. And there must probably have been some amongst them who were familar with the fights of Omri's time, either through their own youthful recollections or the narratives of their fathers. In any case there must have been people then living who knew the alleged origin and original application of the proverbial sayings. How then could E venture on such a substitution? Or how could it have originated prior to him?[2]

As the songs of that book refer rather to the ancient days, so are we quite at liberty to fix on the period of Solomon or David as that in which they were collected and at the same time connected together by means of a brief accompanying text.[3] The period of national unification and exaltation could not but call up of itself the recollection of the battles of ancient times, and suggest the collection of the heroic songs which had survived from thence. The songs themselves are therefore naturally to be dated still earlier,[4] and as a rule will have followed very closely after the events they depict.

[1] See Stade, *Gesch.* i. p. 59 (E about 750).

[2] The comparison with the *Sepher ha-Yashâr* furnishes a further reason (see p. 92).

[3] Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 202.

[4] Ewald, *Gesch.*[3] i. p. 99 ff., Eng. Trans. p. 74.

The other book cannot have been compiled earlier than David's reign, for it contained a song[1] ascribed to him. The meaning of its name is not quite clear,[2] but may most probably be taken to be 'The Book of the Excellent,' its burden, accordingly, being the noble deeds of Israel's choicest sons.[3] According to the two fragments which have been preserved to us,[4] it was a national book of songs resembling the Book of the Wars. The very circumstance that its contents were partly taken up with the battles of the conquest period throws light on Meyer's view as to the Book of the Wars which we have already opposed.

Furthermore, we have a number of elements in E's work concerning which he does not directly assert that what he here relates or communicates is taken from a specifically mentioned book, but declares that it was sung as he gives it, in ancient times or the most ancient times, by the populace or by certain definite individuals, or was written down by persons whom he mentions. The first and the last class of these references to a former time, at all events, justify the inference that ancient sources, whether oral or written, were made use of.

The following belong to the first class: the Song concerning the fights in the territory of Moab[5] and the Song of the Well.[6] The contents of the former are fairly conclusive as to its belonging to the Book of the Wars of Yahvé. To the second class belong the Pæan after the passage through the Red Sea,[7] which is found in two forms, a shorter and an enlarged one; the saying of Moses when the Ark set forward in the Wilderness;[8] the so-called

[1] 2 Sam. i. 18. It is in the highest degree uncertain whether Bleek-Wellhausen, *Einl.*, p. 36, is right in adding 1 Kings viii. 35, according to the LXX.

[2] Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften A T.*, p. 202, thinks of the opening words of the first song.

[3] The majority think so. See Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 488.

[4] Besides 2 Sam. i. 18 it contained Josh. x. 12 f.

[5] Num. xxi. 27-30. [6] Num. xxi. 17, 18*a*.

[7] Ex. xv. 20 f. This is the beginning of the oldest form of the song ascribed to Miriam. In addition to it E (probably J also) is acquainted with a more enlarged form of the song (Ex. xv. 1-19), which is placed in the mouth of Moses. See below, §§ 21 and 23.

[8] Num. x. 35 f.

Blessing of Moses;[1] and a Song of Moses which is no longer extant in the form handed down by E.[2] The Book of the Covenant, together with the Decalogue[3] and the account of the slaughter of the Amalekites,[4] must be reckoned in the third class.

There can hardly be a doubt that in all these cases E made use of ancient materials. In the two last-named cases the idea that written matter was used is demanded by E's direct assertion to this effect. The infrequency of his appeal to written documents ought to prevent our deeming it a fiction when it does occur.[5] In most of the other cases the probabilities are the same. The passages of folk-song probably circulated orally; the songs may have found their way into one of the two collections named above, or into others similar to them, long before E's time. The Blessing of Moses, like that of Jacob in J (Gen. xlix.), was doubtless originally a separate writing.

It is difficult to fix the date of these ancient materials. The Song of Moses at the Red Sea, perhaps also that which once stood in Deut. xxxii., may probably be regarded as the first to find a place in the *Sepher ha-Yashâr*. The Song at the Sea, at any rate in its enlarged form, points to Canaan, probably indeed to the time of David or Solomon.[6] The ground-work of the Song may very well go back to the time of Moses.

Wellhausen[7] and Kuenen[8] place J's Blessing of Jacob in the time of the conflict between Aram and the kingdom of Ephraim in the ninth century, Stade[9] in Ahab's time. But far more reasons than those in favour of a late composition can be urged for a considerably earlier period, coming indeed within that of the

[1] Deut. xxxiii. The Blessing of Jacob in Gen. xlix. was much more readily adopted by J than by E. See below, § 13. [2] See below, § 21.

[3] Ex. xx. 1-17 (except *v.* 11 and isolated additions), 18-26; Ex. xxi., xxii., xxiii. 1-7, 20-22; *cf.* Ex. xxiv. 4, 7. On the Book of the Covenant *cf.* Rothstein, *Das Bundesbuch*, i. 1888; Nauman, *Dekalog und Bundesbuch*, *ZKWL.* 1888, 551 ff.; Montefiore, *Jew. Qu. Rev.*, 1891, p. 285 ff.; Budde, *ZA W.* 1891, p. 99 ff.; Baentsch, *Das Bundesbuch*, 1892.

[4] Ex. xvii. 8-16; *cf. v.* 14. [5] Jülicher, at least at Ex. xvii.

[6] *V.* 13 ff. presupposes the settlement in the country, and *v.* 17 probably that around the sanctuary. See below, § 21. [7] *Gesch. Isr.*[1] p. 375.

[8] *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 16. [9] *Gesch. d.* V. *Isr.*, p. 150.

Judges.[1] The Blessing of Moses, on the contrary, is certainly later than the Division of the Kingdom,[2] but in all probability not much later. For the manner in which that event is mentioned shows that is still an open wound. It will therefore be needful to think rather of the period of Jeroboam I.[3] than of that when Jeroboam II.[4] reigned.

The date of the Decalogue and of the Book of the Covenant must be dealt with more closely when we come to treat of the Mosaic history. It must suffice here to establish the fact that E in any case had written material to work from;[5] and further, that the Book of the Covenant now extant, allowing for such individual traces of later revision[6] as are quite intelligible in so fundamental a document, may very well date from a time considerably earlier than the monarchy. No reference to that period can anywhere be detected. Nor is there anything in the book that conveys the impression of our not having to do with a monument of the oldest Hebrew literature, as E asserts. The only question is whether the Book of the Covenant presupposes Israel's settled life in the land or its abode in the wilderness. The former of the two alternatives has been accepted, in accordance with a number of indications, and is probably correct. It would indeed be possible to explain the references to the settled life in Canaan contained in the Book of the Covenant by saying that before Israel entered the land the lawgiver made preparatory arrangements in which he took the settlement for granted. Hence that idea cannot be declared impossible. But the manner in which this abode in Canaan is here presupposed and treated as a fact needing no explanation, makes

[1] Dillmann, *Gen.*[5] p. 448, follows Ewald and many others in this. The fact that the tribe of Levi is still supposed to be depressed tells against Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 200 (David—Solomon).

[2] Because of Deut. xxxiii. 7, see above, p. 89.

[3] See De Wette-Schrader, *Eind.*[8] p. 318 ff.

[4] As Reuss does, *Gesch. d. AT.*, §§ 213, 216, following Graf and Bleek. Also Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 16, and Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 160.

[5] See above, and especially Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 220 f.

[6] Especially at the close of chap. xxii. (*v.* 19-26?), and in chap. xxiii. (at all events *v.* 23 ff).

it seem more natural to the unprejudiced reader that the laws in their present shape were drawn up in Canaan itself, and were based on the procedure customary there.[1] This would bring us to the time subsequent to Israel's entrance into Canaan. I do not venture to offer precise details with regard to the authorship of the book. The one opinion which seems to me altogether doubtful[2] is that which takes the points of contact between the prophets of the eighth century and the Book of the Covenant and the Decalogue as tokens of their having been written contemporaneously. If E regards the book as an extremely ancient composition and brings it before his readers as such, this would be an incomprehensibly daring proceeding supposing, as Kuenen does, the work were scarcely a few decades old.

Besides the sources expressly named by E, he must have had many others at his disposal which have left in his work several traces of their existence. For example, E recounts the last stations of Israel's march to Canaan in a piece, the style of which is in the highest degree peculiar,[3] and the continuation of which is found in quite another place:[4] in its complete shape it probably formed the parallel to the more detailed list handed down[5] in P. It is probable that the source here used contained other matter than the mere list of stations, and also that other experiences of Israel in the earliest times were recorded in the book where E found the account of the slaughter of the Amalekites.[6] When we remember that Gen. xiv. also, in all probability, points to a special document which E was able to make use of, it cannot seem unduly bold to sum up our final judgment on the writing E as follows:— In many cases it is demonstrable that E worked in accordance with sources that were ancient and, in part, very ancient. And further, where this cannot now be discerned, we may accept his descriptions as resting on older material, oral or written, except where there are conclusive reasons of a special kind to the contrary.

[1] See above, § 5.
[2] Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 20.
[3] Num. xxi. 12 f., 18*b*-20.
[4] Deut. x. 6 f.
[5] Num. xxxiii.
[6] Ex. xvii. 14.

We do not seem to be so favourably situated with regard to the writing J. There is but one instance where it can be held with certainty that J expressly mentions a document.[1] What is meant is the brief law-book appended to the Decalogue, which in J takes the place of the Book of the Covenant,[2] and has been mistakenly asserted to be the original Decalogue.[3] Moreover, it is certain that J possessed the Decalogue in a form essentially identical with E's, which the reviser accordingly thought it unnecessary to retain. And it is probable, or at least possible, that J also gave the enlarged form of the Song at the Sea.[4] There are no direct indications of the employment of other documents.[5] At the most it can only be inferred from the context in J that the author knew and used the ancient account of the slaughter of the Amalekites.[6] But seeing it has already been shown that E's book lay before J and was largely used by him, his contributions, where they coincide with E's, are guaranteed by the character of this writing. Examples have been adduced above and must be taken into account, proving that he treated with a somewhat free hand the material he took from E. It is also intrinsically likely that, in addition to E, J had before him, in whole or in part, the sources from which E drew. The old songs and proverbs, for example, had not lost their voice in his day; the old books of the heroes were not yet lost. Where, however, J deviates from E, each case must be decided on its merits. In many instances of this kind, there are clear indications that, besides the stores of information accessible to E, J knew independently of other ancient and precious ones, and embodied them in his work.

§ 9. *The Priestly Writing.*

If we remove from our present Hexateuch the portions which have been treated of hitherto, there will remain, in addition to a

[1] Ex. xxxiv. 27.
[2] Ex. xxxiv. 11-26.
[3] See more details under § 20 f.
[4] Ex. xv. 1-19; see above, p. 92.
[5] Except perhaps Gen. xlix., on which see above, p. 92 f.
[6] Ex. xvii. 8 ff.

comparatively small number of editorial additions, a large connected document. In terminology and ideas it is markedly distinguished from the other sources of the Hexateuch. Its peculiar style,[1] not very flowing, usually characterised by prolix phraseology and extensive repetitions; its formal and constantly recurring phrases; the rigid system[2] on which it is constructed; its almost everywhere evident fondness for discussions[3] on matters of law; these, and many other signs, have made it feasible to distinguish the constituents of this book more certainly than those of any other source of the Hexateuch. There is an almost universal agreement as to its extent. The book used to be called the 'Grundschrift' of the Hexateuch, so long as it was believed to be very ancient: now it is more correctly entitled the Priestly Writing (P), or, by Wellhausen, the Priests' Code (PC.). The justification of this title is unequivocally furnished by the characteristics which everywhere confront us.[5] But the designation, 'Fundamental Writing,' could only reckon on general acceptance to-day in the restricted sense that the editor pieced together the various writings of the Hexateuch in such a way as almost everywhere to make P's line of thought the foundation of the whole, and wherever possible to work the other writings into this.

But whilst this book, as a whole, is bound together by many striking tokens of connection, it is not a perfect unity in the strict sense of a writing conceived and written out by the same author, *uno tenore*. There are a number of pieces which, according to their characteristics, lie within the general framework of the Priestly

[1] For more particulars respecting its style and narration, see Dillmann, *NuDtJo.*, pp. 648 f., 663.

[2] On this, see especially the essay by Nöldeke, which will be mentioned immediately.

[3] Among others, *cf.* Wurster, *Zur Charakteristik und Gesch. des Priestercodex*, etc., in *ZAW.* iv. p. 111 ff.

[4] Especially since the appearance of Nöldeke's writing, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des AT.*, 1869, i., *Die sogen. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs.* Further, *cf.* especially Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 6; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 634 ff., and the analysis of P's narratives given by us in §§ 14 and 22.

[5] On this see Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 5, p. 54; § 6, p. 72 f.; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 652 f.

Writing; but when sifted more thoroughly are found to be different from the genuine constituents of P. This comes about partly in the following manner: the author of the great historico-legal work, P, found ready to hand a number of older legal pieces, and incorporated them in his work with greater or smaller modifications. And partly it came about as follows: subsequently to the composition of the main work, P, which was founded on those older laws, a later writer, working, however, in P's spirit and language, made various additions which, again, were chiefly of a legal nature. The essential resemblance between all three stages of the entire work has led to the retention of the title P for them all, with P^1 as the name of the older groundwork, P^2 as that of the main work, the priestly history from the Creation to the Settlement in Canaan, and P^3 as that of the later additions,

The principle is undoubtedly correct. For it lies in the nature of the case, and is demonstrable by many tokens, that the composition of the great legal work took place in stages. They have, however, not yet been analysed in such a way as to command universal assent. Amongst later writers Kayser,[1] Wellhausen,[2] and Horst[3] particularly have taken pains with the analysis of the groundwork, especially in Lev. xvii.-xxvi. I myself have endeavoured to follow the traces of earlier portions of the Priestly Writing even beyond the limits of the body of laws just named.[4] Kuenen[5] and Dillmann[6] have recently maintained that P^2 found certain longer passages already extant. Wellhausen[7] and Kuenen,[8] in particular, have designated some passages as later elements (P^3), but in part have been opposed by Dillmann.[9] This question, in other respects a purely literary one, is only important to us in so far as it may supply a starting-point for dating the Priestly

[1] *Das vorexil. Buch der Urgeschichte Israel's und seine Erweiterung*, p. 64 ff.
[2] *JDTh.* xxii. p. 422 ff.
[3] *Levit.* xvii.-xxvi. *und Hezechiel*, 1881.
[4] *ThStW.* ii. pp. 160-162, p. 44 f.; iii. p. 263 f. In greater detail see p. 120, Note 4.
[5] *Ond.*[2] § 6.
[6] *NuDtJo.*, pp. 637 f., 639 ff.
[7] *JDTh.* xxii. p. 407 ff. *passim.*
[8] *Ond.*[2] § 6.
[9] *NuDtJo.*, pp. 641 ff., 672 ff.

Writing proper (Kuenen's P^2), and thus indirectly fixing the age of its earlier and later interpolations.

On this point, the fixing of P's age, our interest in this writing reaches its climax. It seemed formerly as though the problem had been resolved by the almost undisputed acceptance of the early part of the kingly period as the time when the Grundschrift was composed. But the question was re-started by K. H. Graf. Within the last decade Wellhausen's *History of Israel* has brought it into the very foreground of discussion and made it the burning question in the historiography of the people of Israel, nay, in Old Testament criticism generally. As yet it has not received a final, or, at all events, a universally accepted answer.

It is well known how Graf and Kayser, in the first instance following the lead of Reuss and Vatke, and then especially Kuenen and Wellhausen, have advocated the view[1] that the Priestly Writing stands at the close, not the opening, of the Hexateuch literature, and that its earliest portions orignated in the exilic, its main mass in the post-exilic period. According to this, the so-called Grafian hypothesis, the priestly law-book which Ezra gave to the people who had returned from Babylon was a document which had only just come into being, not one that had been extant earlier.

When this hypothesis was first propounded, a strong inclination was felt in many quarters to regard it as an insubstantial phantom, the product of wanton hypercriticism. Nor was it otherwise when Graf and Wellhausen adopted it. Such a verdict is no longer possible. In consequence of the defence, in many respects brilliant, and the undeniably thorough method of proof pursued especially by Wellhausen and Kuenen, an unprejudiced judgment must concede that the reasons advanced in favour of this view are real and in some measure weighty. The completeness and finish of the picture of Israel's religious history, seemingly obtained through this view of the composition of the Priest's Code, contributes more than any other cause to give it a telling

[1] See above, the Survey of the Course of Criticism, § 6.

influence over many minds. The marked distinction which it enables us to make between the various periods: the regularly progressive development of the course of history which unfolds before our eyes when we occupy this standpoint: the simple explanation which this theory gives of the artificial system found in P, and of the ideal picture, which in many respects does not strictly accord with history—all these things really compel us to think.

Yet, after going afresh through all the elements of the problem, I am still unable to agree with this view. Weightier reasons on the other side have left on me the impression that this picture of a development satisfactory in itself, and, in fact, of a building up of Israel's history coming about naturally and growing as it were of its own accord, though dazzling at the first glance, is but an illusion containing more of fallacious appearance than of enduring reality.[1]

1. In the first place, the whole method by which these conclusions are reached excites a certain amount of distrust.[2] All the advocates of the Grafian hypothesis from Graf downwards have appealed primarily to the contrast between the ritual conditions and usages recognisable in P and those which are to be seen in the rest of the Hexateuch, as well as in the rest of the Old Testament. Compared with this evidence derived from the ritual, that furnished by linguistic and literary considerations always stands in the background, and supplies a merely supplementary confirmation of the result already obtained.[3] Considering how the case stands this will be found quite natural. The result itself is reached as follows. In several places in P institutions are assumed to be already in existence, which, as a matter of fact, did not obtain unquestioned recognition till after the Exile. The argument is that, seeing P assumes them to be already in existence, this work cannot have been written till after the Exile, or, at any rate, till these ordinances were legally established.

[1] On this see also Steiner in *Theol. Zeitschr. a. d. Schr.*, 1887, p. 207.

[2] With reference to Wellhausen, *cf.* my detailed discussion of this point in *ThStW.* ii. (1881) p. 150 ff., also p. 40.

[3] Kayser, *Vorexil. Buch.*, p. 3: 'The result obtained from the history of law and worship must be tested by that won from the literary history.'

This method of proof might appear suitable if P were to be treated as an historical document in the ordinary sense of the word. P is not a document of that kind, and cannot be used without further proof as a source of historical information respecting the circumstances actually prevalent at the time of its composition.

The advocates of the view in question are without exception convinced themselves that P is not a strictly historical monument of its own times. The only possible question for them is whether P is a fiction invented for a purpose and ascribed to primal antiquity, or an ideal sketch drawn with a real belief that the privileges it insists on belong to the priests. In either case their conclusion has been reached prematurely. The facts merely entitle sober criticism to infer that P arose at a time when those demands were *made*, not when they were complied with. For if it is one of P's literary characteristics that he describes what he aims at as existing in the time of Moses, it must be impossible to argue from his depicting an institution as existing that it does actually exist: obviously the only conclusion is, that P desired and demanded it.

2. The entire theory rests on the assumption that the national life and religious institutions of Israel developed in a straight line.[1] But it is at least unproved, and as a matter of fact is highly improbable, that the whole history of Israel admits of the application of such a standard. The true state of affairs is more like this. Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writing, each in its own way, are programmes of legislation. Now we see at a glance that in a number of cases P shows progress, a more advanced stage of development as compared with D. From this it is, as a rule, concluded that D is prior to P. This conclusion may be correct in many cases, and we shall carry it out where other

[1] For the rest, see Stade in *Theol. Litt. Zeit.*, 1887, No. 9. But when E, J, and D are compared with the prophetic literature in a different way from P, this is not due to inconsistency, but to the fact that we are dealing with a priestly writing which has little connexion with prophetic circles or prophetic ideas.

reasons permit or demand it. But in, and for itself, and applied to every case, it is not justified. To make it legitimate D and P would have to be legislators of precisely the same kind and tendency. But they are not. Their points of view and circumstances are totally dissimilar. P is a priestly author, writing in the interest of the priesthood. D is a prophetic author, whose story is composed in the interests of the people in general. This is sufficient to prevent all surprise if P, in a number of instances, is found advancing claims on behalf of the priesthood, which go further than D,[1] though written contemporaneously with or even before the latter. The theory of a post-Deuteronomic date for P, based on all cases of this kind, is therefore another instance of a conclusion pushed too far.

3. In reaching the result obtained by the Grafian hypothesis the *argumentum e silentio* is very largely used. There are, in fact, a number of occasions in D and the pre-exilic prophets where P must infallibly have been mentioned, or at least referred to, if it had been a publicly recognised and binding law-book. If in several cases there is no such mention, the conclusion seems self-evident that P was composed after the Exile, especially seeing that the post-exilic prophets and writers suddenly refer to P in a striking fashion. But this conclusion becomes at least doubtful as soon as we observe that the whole character of P proves it to have been originally not a public ecclesiastical law, but—though not a merely private document—a programme known at first to the priests alone, and struggling long for recognition till favouring circumstances helped it to obtain this. Granted that it was subsequent to the Exile that this was reached, yet the fact of the book not being named, as well as the above-mentioned fact that it was not obeyed in earlier times, is far from being a conclusive proof of its not having been composed prior to the Exile. That the Priestly Writing is not named in places when it might have been expected allows not only of the conclusion that it was not in

[1] See also my discussion of the subject in *ThStW.* ii. p. 37, and Baudissin, *Der heutige Stand. der alttest. Wissensch.* p. 50 f.

existence, but of two other conclusions which are not to be rejected without examination. P may have been extant and the prophetical writers have been unacquainted with it, or they may have known the priestly writing and have declined to recognise it. In either case there was no reason why they should refer to P as a public law-book of admitted authority. Nor can it be objected that in the first of the supposed cases P would have led an unnaturally hidden 'trance-like' existence. Its requirements as laid down by the priests of Jerusalem might very well be familiar to the prophets without the latter knowing and stating that they were codified and were ascribed to Moses. For this nothing was needed save that the prophets should be unacquainted with the esoteric literature of the priestly circle. And this is not an unheard-of assumption. Still less can the second supposition be summarily dismissed as impossible. For it is a matter of fact that during the last centuries of the Jewish commonwealth previous to the Exile there was a certain opposition between priests and prophets, and a polemic of the latter against the former on many points. Some of these attacks on the priests by the prophets actually originated in certain laws promulgated by the priests which seemed to the prophets arbitrary and selfish.[1] And though these priestly Tôrôth may not necessarily be identical with P or with some of its constituents, these circumstances would sufficiently justify some mistrust on the part of prophecy towards the legislation of the priestly circle.[2]

4. Fourthly, and finally, to these general considerations must be added a number of details which appear to preclude the idea of the post-exilic composition of P

(*a.*) The account in Neh. viii.-x. of Ezra's public reading of the law-book of Moses on the new moon of the seventh month in the year 445, does not convey the impression that this law-book had only just been composed. And that idea becomes still harder to accept when we remember that in all probability the law then

[1] See also *ThStW.* ii. p. 530.
[2] On this compare also again Vatke, *Einl.*, p. 402 f.

read aloud was not merely P but the whole Pentateuch.[1] The contrary opinion has indeed been unhesitatingly maintained,[2] but is not easily tenable in face of the definite data[3] found in Neh. viii. ff. On the assumption[4] that Ezra read nothing but the Priestly Writing to the people, it has been deemed possible to draw a parallel between the discovery and promulgation of Deuteronomy on the one hand and of the Priestly Writing on the other. The latter procedure appeared thus to be a mere copy of the former. As Josiah in former days laid before the people a newly-found law-book, the contents of which had not previously been known, so Ezra now.[5] But it is evident that if Ezra's law-book contained not only P but other admittedly older writings as well, the parallel will not hold good. Moreover, there are other reasons against it. Josiah's law-book is first of all found; the circumstances attending its discovery are described in detail; it comes before the reader as a something entirely unknown, or at all events no longer known, in Judah. Of Ezra's law-book it is merely said that he brought it with him from Babylonia, because he was the man called to do this. There is nowhere anything said about its being just found or its coming to light in any unexpected way. But if we are to believe that its history is parallel to that of Deuteronomy, we should at least expect to be informed how Ezra came into possession of it. This also is not done. On the contrary, the people already know of the existence of the book,[6] and appear simply to

[1] Colenso; Kuen. *Religion of Israel*, ii. p. 223 ff.; Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] pp. 430, 434 (Eng. Trans., p. 407, etc.), and *JDTh.* xxii. p. 459; D. Hoffmann in the *Magaz. f. d. Wissenschaft d. Judent.*, 1879, p. 5 f.; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 672.

[2] Reuss, *Histoire Sainte*, p. 233 ff.; *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 462 ff.; Kayser, *Vorex. Buch*, p. 195 f.; *JPTh.*, 1881, p. 534 ff.; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 11, § 15, No. 25 (p. 294 f.); Kosters, *Het Herstel van Israël*, 1894, p. 90.

[3] *Cf.* Neh. x. 31 with Ex. xxxiv. 12, 15 f. Deut. vii. 2 ff. Neh. x. 32*b* with Deut. xv. 2 (Ex. xxiii. 11).

[4] Wellhausen, and Kuenen in *Religion of Israel*, without this assumption. But in that case the essential point in the parallel does not correspond, and the parallelism at once falls to the ground.

[5] Kuen., *Religion of Israel*, ii. p. 230 ff.; Lagarde, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1870, p. 1557 f.; Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 433 f. (Eng. Trans. p. 408 f.)

[6] Neh. viii. 1: 'The people gathered together . . . and spake unto Ezra to bring the book of the law of Moses.' Quite otherwise as to Deuteronomy, at 2 Kings xxiii.

have failed to observe its contents. With this it agrees that in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Haggai, there is an evident acquaintance with some of P's laws prior to this re-introduction of the Law.[1] The novelty therefore would seem to consist rather in the editing of the book that was read, and the placing it in the canon, than in its contents.

(*b.*) The chief weapons for the vindication of this theory have been forged out of the relation between P on the one hand and D and Ezekiel on the other. Yet that very relation, even when looked at from a general point of view, is altogether unfavourable to the idea. The differences between P on the one side and D and Ezekiel on the other, are so striking that it is difficult to understand how an entirely new law-book could win recognition alongside the latter. It is indeed maintained that although the book is new it claimed to be the ancient product of Moses and thus was able to conceal the lateness of its origin. But how could it create a belief in its Mosaic authorship, opposed as it is to D and Ezekiel? This is a riddle which can only be read on the assumption that P did not first arise after the Exile, but existed previously, even if it were only as a sort of private document known only to the priests. In this way it is conceivable how a book, which increased in influence alongside Deuteronomy, and after the Exile was handed down as a historical factor like Deuteronomy and Ezekiel, could, notwithstanding its discrepancies with these writings, be worked up with D by the editor, and acknowledged like it by the people. The admission of P in spite of its differences from D and Ezekiel can therefore be explained in no other way than by saying that it was not composed after the Exile, but its laws, being already in existence, were then revised. It is not at all astonishing that Ezekiel differs from P.[2] This is explained not only by the fact that P had not yet obtained official recognition—for the prophet allows himself to vary also from D, which had been officially adopted—but yet more by the

[1] Ezra ii. 36 ff.; Neh. vi. 10 f., xii. 35, 41; Hagg. ii. 11.

[2] As Kuenen thinks, *Ond.*[2] § 12, No. 8.

prophet's freedom to remould by virtue of his original divine inspiration what he found already existent and acknowledged.[1]

(*c.*) But leaving aside details, it is inconceivable how the ancient writings should for a long time have been largely read and have become common property, and then, in the fifth century, new traditions of a legal, and especially of a historical nature, deviating entirely from the old, should have sprung up in such abundance as we find in P. Dillmann[2] rightly instances such parallels as Gen. i. compared with Gen. ii. f., or as to the localties of the deaths of Moses and Aaron, and the like. There would be no sense in the putting P on a level with the other writings if its contents had not been genuine ancient traditions. Its peculiar tendency is far from sufficing to explain all its divergences from the other sources of the Hexateuch. And here again it is easy to understand the action taken by a post-exilic editor who reverently puts together the materials handed down from ancient times, although in some parts they are mutually contradictory, but difficult to understand that of a post-exilic author of P.

(*d.*) Finally, attention has with good reason been called to a number of elements in P which have no connection with the circumstances of Israel after the Exile. On the other hand, the omission of institutions which in that very period had become of special importance is almost more striking still. As to the latter point the precepts respecting the pilgrimages, for example, deserve to be emphasised: they were much thought of in later times, but they have no place in P. And with reference to the former point Dillmann[3] specifies the statutes relating to the territories of the tribes, the cities of the Levites and of Refuge, the law of war and of booty, the laws too concerning the Ark of the Covenant, Urim and Thummim, the anointing of the High Priest, and the agrarian laws which take for granted the right to dispose freely of land.

[1] Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 667; Baudissin, *Der heut. Stand. d. altt. Wiss.*, p. 52.
[2] *NuDtJo.*, p. 670.
[3] *NuDtJo.*, p. 670.

§ 10. *Continuation. The Grounds on which P is considered Post-Exilic.*

It must be confessed that thus far we have only adduced a number of arguments *against* the post-exilic composition of P. Yet there has been no attempt to suppress the fact that reasons of no inconsiderable force can be urged *in favour of* that theory. I now proceed to set forth the main points in these reasons, leaving the reader to form a decided opinion on this hitherto unsettled dispute. I myself am not at present convinced that these arguments prove P to have been composed after the Exile. I therefore immediately subjoin the considerations which appear to me to detract considerably from the cogency of these arguments. The general principles laid down above will serve for our guidance here.

1. *Archæological Considerations.*—The proofs alleged for the Grafian hypothesis divide into three classes.[1] The advocates of this view have explored the Hexateuch on the linguistic, the literary, and the material (*i.e.* the archæological, ceremonial-history) sides, to collect on these three roads materials for the establishment of their theory. The most important of these regions is the history of the ritual. Graf[2] himself preferred to appeal to it, and Wellhausen[3] has taken it up again with peculiar skill and success. The weightiest factors in the question are the place of divine service, the sacrifices, the festivals, the holy persons.

As to *the place*[4] set apart for divine service the history outside

[1] Stade, *Theol. Litt. Zeit.*, 1887, No. 9, has recently advanced a fourth point of view, the religious. We can but agree with him. But the bulk of the work in this respect is yet to be done. The views which Stade there goes on to propound will arouse much suspicion on this ground alone, that according to the view of most students Jesus attached himself much less to P than to the religious consciousness of the prophets. How can P (with sacrificial worship, Levitical purity, etc.) stand nearer than the prophets to the salvation of the New Testament?

[2] *Die geschicht. Büch. d. AT.*, pp. 36-68.

[3] *Proleg. zur Gesch. Isr.*[2] pp. 17-174 (Eng. Trans. pp. 17-171).

[4] For this *cf.*, in general, Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] pp. 17-54 (Eng. Trans. pp. 17-52), and Kuen., *Ond.*[2] § 11, pp. 194-197; on the other side my discussion in *ThStW.* ii. pp. 33-47; Bredenkamp, *Gesetz. und Proph.*, pp. 129-171.

the Hexateuch clearly exhibits three main stages of development. Hebrew antiquity, after the settlement in Canaan and from the period of the Judges downwards, shows a certain amount of freedom. Before the building of the Temple an offering could be presented anywhere, that is, wherever a place of sacrifice already existed,[1] or the worshipper made one by rearing an altar.[2] And after the building of the temple this freedom of movement may have lasted unopposed for some time.[3] How long this continued is open to question, because the utterances of the prophets of the eighth century and also of Micah on this point[4] are not quite above doubt. Josiah, at all events, introduced a change. His reformation did away with the local sanctuaries, called high-places, in favour of the Temple in Jerusalem. After his death much of his reform appears to have fallen into decay. It is not till the post-exilic period that we see the picture of a divine service centralised in Jerusalem without opposition and without exception.

Using this statement of the matter as a test for the Priestly Writing it is easy to reach the result that it was composed after the Exile. So far as the place of divine service is concerned the Book of the Covenant and the narrative of E and J, which allow of many altars in the land, 'in every place where I make My Name to be honoured,'[5] are in accord with the older custom. D, which demands the centralisation of worship, is a product of the seventh century: P, it is therefore argued, must belong to the time of the Restoration. For only then could the unity of the sanctuary be taken for granted. Both P and D wish to have only one sanctuary allowed. The essential difference between them is, that whereas

[1] *Cf.*, as to Bochim, Ophrah, Mispah, Gilgal, Bethlehem, etc., the passages Judges ii. 5, vi. 24 ff.; viii. 27; xx. 1; 1 Sam. vii. 9; Judges xx. 23, 26 ff.; xxi. 2, 4; 1 Sam. x. 3, 5; x. 8; xi. 15; xiii. 9; xvi. 4 ff.; xx. 29.

[2] *Cf.* 1 Sam. vii. 17; xiv. 35; 2 Sam. vi. *passim.*

[3] *Cf.* Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. 30 ff. (xix. 10, 14); pious kings like Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham.

[4] On Micah i. 5 see Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 11, No. 8. The LXX., when 5*a* is taken into account, makes the reading במות, not indeed impossible, but somewhat doubtful.

[5] Ex. xx. 24, *cf.* Dillm. *in loc.* It is true that this condition does not allow of the using any spot indifferently as a place of sacrifice, but it admits any where a manifestation of Yahvé can be shown to have occurred.

the latter only demands the establishment of this unity, the former can assume that the demand has been complied with.

But it must not be overlooked that weighty objections can be urged against this argument. Does the Priestly Writing really pre-suppose the centralisation? And if it does, is the author acquainted with this as an accomplished historical fact? Further, does the demand for centralisation appear in Deuteronomy (or under Josiah) for the first time, or can we trace it earlier?

There is no question that when P prescribes the unity of the sanctuary, he rather assumes its existence than orders it. But we must deny that he takes it for granted absolutely. If only a few cases can be indicated where P as well as D demands the centralisation, there will be very weighty evidences in favour of the opinion now to be maintained. For it goes without saying that we ought not to reckon on finding a large number of cases, seeing that we are dealing with exceptions to the rule. I find such cases in Lev. xvii. and Num. xvi. 8 ff. It will hardly be possible to dispute that the latter passage, the account of Korah's faction, has certain historical conflicts between priests and Levites for its historical background. True, the unity of the sanctuary is not directly in question. But indirectly it is. For those conflicts must have been most intimately connected with the exclusion of the Levites from the sacrificial office, which was the natural consequence of the centralisation. There is nothing to suggest post-exilic complications.[1]

If we here for the first time come across the attempt to set aside the Levites and unify in the Temple the service of God, we also see the same in Lev. xvii. 3 ff. Here, too, there is nothing to imply that the centralisation has actually been effected. We have but a demand for it.[2] There is nothing to prevent our use of this passage as illustrating P's views[3] in the fact that Lev. xvii.-xxvi.

[1] As Kayser thinks, *JPTh.* vii. p. 642, and Wurster, *ZAW.* iv. p. 116, note. Reuss also, *Gesch. d. AT.*, recognises here a *pre*-exilic antagonism, although he declines to draw the conclusion.

[2] Wellhausen also thinks thus, *Proleg.*[2] p. 400 (Eng. Trans. p. 376 f.).

[3] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 53 (Eng. Trans. p. 86).

originally existed in an independent, though simpler form, and subsequently was adopted by P. If he or one of his successors[1] adopted it, the probability is extremely great in favour of his having agreed with it. Besides which he adapted,[2] as well as adopted it, without altering the demand which is alleged to be opposed to his own views. Finally, it is impossible to discover in it any contradiction of the principles elsewhere maintained by P.[3] Even such a contradiction would not be directly fatal to our view.

Yet it must be granted that, as a rule, P looks on the centralisation as needing no explanation, no enforcing. He takes it for granted, as a custom established and unopposed from ancient times. But the exceptions just indicated must not be lost sight of. What then does this fact point to when you are dealing with a writing of such a nature and tendency as the Priests' Code? Remembering the canon laid down at p. 101, can we infer more than that P made use of this form of statement in order to bring about the unity of the sanctuary; in other words, that in his time it was not actually established but was striven after?

To what period does this bring us? If the propositions already advanced are correct, we may reply in general terms that it is the period immediately after the attempt at unification began. For it would have been strange if P's circle, the priesthood of Jerusalem, had not, from the very first, taken advantage of the idea of the unification of all sacrificial worship at Jerusalem. It is not equally easy to fix the date more precisely. Natural as it is to believe that there was a vigorous striving for unification immediately after the

[1] See below, p. 128.

[2] Wellh. *JDTh.* xxii. p. 425. Kayser, *Das vorex. Buch*, p. 69, and *JPTh.*, 1881, p. 541 ff. Horst, *Lev.* xvii.-xxvi. *und Hez.*, p. 14 ff. Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 6, No. 27 f.

[3] On Gen. ix. 3 f. and Lev. vii. 22 ff. see Dillmann, *ExLev.*, p. 535, also *ThStW.* ii. p. 43. Differently Wurster, *ZAW.* iv. p. 120. But in Gen. ix. there is a perfectly general permission to eat flesh: no account is taken as to whether the animal is clean or unclean, fit or unfit for sacrifice. As is usual in P when the pre-Mosaic times are described, it is not sacrifices that are spoken of: we are therefore only able to decide whether slaughter for other purposes is permitted by studying later passages in P, Lev. xvii. in particular.

building of Solomon's Temple[1] there are just as few tangible points of support for this in early times. But it is in any case a mistake to maintain with Wellhausen[2] that the demand for unification did not arise prior to Josiah. Before Josiah's reform there was an attempt at reform by Hezekiah, on which Wellhausen[3] casts doubt without sufficient reasons.[4] It may have produced little result, but it is a conclusive proof that eighty years before Josiah's work the same thought had struck vigorous root. Hezekiah's attempted reform is therefore the remotest point in the history to which we are driven by the idea of unity represented in P. But on the other hand it is not advisable to go further back, at all events for the author who adopted and worked up Lev. xvii. ff. The killing of the sacrifices at Jerusalem could hardly be insisted on with the northern kingdom in view. But it might when this had been led into exile.[5]

P.'s theory of *sacrifice* is another point where we may compare this document with the customs exemplified in the history. This comparison is supposed to lead anew to the conclusion, that prior to the Exile the sacrificial Torah of the Priestly Writing was unknown.[6]

Here again the history exhibits considerable freedom. In earlier times sacrifices were offered with little or no regard to the ritual codified in P.[7] Many of these liberties may perhaps be explained by local circumstances or old-established abuses. But it is clear from the state of affairs depicted in the historical books that in earlier times and up to the Exile the ritual in P as a whole was not recognised as practically binding. Wellhausen[8] concludes

[1] Nöldeke, *Unters. z. Krit. d. AT.*, p. 127 f.

[2] *Proleg.*[2] p. 28 (Eng. Trans. p. 27).

[2] *Proleg.*[2] pp. 26, 48 ff. (Eng. Trans. pp. 25, 46 ff.).

[4] See 2 Kings xviii. p. 4, and especially *v.* 22, and on this Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 11, No. 9; Finsler, *Darstell. und Krit. der Ansicht Wellh.* (Zürich, 1887), p. 54.

[5] What Kuenen, § 11, No. 20*a*, says concerning the time when Lev. xvii. became practicable is not clear. The law in its present form was not practicable whilst the many sanctuaries were standing. But in its original form it probably arose at that time, and Kuenen, § 14, No. 6, denies this without justification.

[6] See Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] pp. 54-85; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 11, pp. 204-206.

[7] *Cf.* Judges vi. 19-21; 1 Sam. ix. 13 ff. (vii. 6); xiv. 35; 1 Kings xix. 21; 2 Kings v. 17.

[8] *Proleg.*[2] p. 62 (Eng. Trans. p. 60).

from this that whilst the temple stood there was no established ritual. He thinks Ezekiel began the codification of the precepts relating to sacrifice, and finds it easy to understand how 'the holy customs of former days became the subject-matter of theory and writing' in and after the Exile.[1]

These theses are contradicted by much which they are unable to explain. We may readily grant that the ritual in P, especially in Lev. i.-vii., received its present shape in comparatively recent times. This is in fact indicated by the condition in which we find these laws, in which ancient elements, some of them very ancient, may be distinguished from more recent ones.[2] But it is in the highest degree improbable that the groundwork, at least, of the extant sacrificial ritual did not exist, both orally and in writing, as the rule for the priests to act on, especially those belonging to the Temple after Solomon's time. Occasional sacrifices brought by individuals, which the historical books are specially fond of relating, may have been offered loosely and according to peculiar ancient traditions, especially in the remoter periods. The great sacrifices at the Temple, which in the course of time gathered round itself a stately priesthood, cannot possibly have been conducted without rule and according to the hurry of the moment. It is intrinsically unlikely that the ritual began to be put into shape during the Exile and from memory.[3] The greater the zeal of the people which the prophets rebuked, the more reasonable is the idea that the sacrifices so zealously performed were subjected to certain fixed rules. When Jeremiah[4] directly attacks commands relating to sacrifice he supplies the proof that he is acquainted with such. Whether it was P's ritual or another's is not the question here.

To conclude that the ritual did not belong to the Torah because the latter at the same time, and in many respects perhaps essentially, consisted of oral and ethical teaching, is to go too far. This is proved not only by passages which mention precepts on subjects related

[1] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 62 (Eng. Trans. p. 60).
[2] See Dillm. *ExLev.*, pp. 373 ff., 386; Wurster, *ZA W.* iv. p. 127.
[3] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 62 (Eng. Trans. p. 60).
[4] Jer. vii. 22.

to and not more important than sacrifices;[1] the nature of the case and the analogy of the other nations of antiquity are still more strongly in favour of this view. Israel came out of, and always continued to be connected with, a country where external prescriptions and rules played their part in all ages. As in Egypt, so in Babylonia and Assyria, rules were laid down for sacrificial worship at an early period. The Marseilles Table of Offerings[2] has brought the same fact to light as regards the Phœnicians. Is it to be believed that with all this scrupulosity on the part of the surrounding priesthoods[3] a primitive informalism, of which there is no other example, prevailed in Israel alone until the days of the Restoration? Could the later tyranny of form and letter have been a mere product of that later time, whilst Jeremiah[4] himself was obliged to oppose priestly misconduct and priests' prescriptions of every kind?

But the sacrificial Torah in P is also supposed to betray its character as a product of the Restoration period by certain novelties that stand in contrast with pre-exilic customs. Wellhausen[5] traces in P a gradual refinement of the sacrifices, the displacement of the flour-offering by the burnt-offering, the introduction of fresh kinds of sacrifices—facts which to him place the post-exilic origin of this Torah beyond doubt.

The general principles thus adduced are beyond dispute. The prevalence of the priests' ritual might easily bring about a refinement of the sacrifices in many directions. And the meal-offering in particular, which plays the chief part on the occasions of popular interest depicted in the stories of earlier times, might be thrown into the shade by the burnt-offering. But this only indicates the natural tendency and actual result of the Torah. It furnishes no proof of later origin, particularly as in P the position

[1] Lev. xx. 25; Deut. xiv. 24, 8; *cf.* Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 386.

[2] See Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, pp. 647, 662; also Baethgen in *Theol. Litt. Zeitg.*, 1887, No. 4.

[3] In addition to this, see also Ribbeck, *Die Dichtung der Römer*, 1887, p. 1 ff.

[4] Jer. vii. 22; viii. 8; *cf.* Isa. xxix. 13.

[5] *Proleg.*[2] 63 ff. (Eng. Trans. p. 61 ff.).

of the thank-offering is fully recognised.[1] The case would indeed be different if it could be shown that certain important kinds of sacrifices mentioned in the Torah are entirely unsupported by pre-exilic custom. Wellhausen has asserted this of the incense-offering and the sin-offering.[2] I cannot admit the correctness of his view except so far as this:—these two forms of sacrifice did not obtain recognition till a comparatively late date, and probably as a result of the developed temple-service. The earlier period, immediately subsequent to Moses, knew them not. But it will be difficult to disprove that both of them were extant and were practised in the kingly period prior to the Exile.[3]

Kuenen,[4] in opposition to Wellhausen, has recently admitted that Hosea[5] was acquainted with the sin-offering. But it can also be shown that Ezekiel, the very author who is asserted to have introduced the sin-offering,[6] knew P's law of the sin-offering. I have endeavoured to set forth the proof of this elsewhere,[7] and may now simply refer to that place. Kayser's[8] rejoinders do not lessen the force of my argument. The incense-offering stands in a similar position. To me it seems to have probably originated in the Temple usages of the kingly period. The altar of incense mentioned in the law may also probably be a mere later addition to P. But neither incense-offering[9] nor incense-altar[10] indicate a period later than the Exile.

The *festivals*[11] of Israel provide an additional opportunity for comparing the Priests' Torah with the life of the people before the Exile. Here, too, the lack of information as to the celebrations, prior to the Exile, of festivals, corresponding to the laws in P, has

[1] Lev. iii. 7, 11-34; *cf.* xxii. 21 ff., 29 ff.; xxiii. 38. On this compare my discussion in *ThStW.* ii. p. 57 f.

[2] *Proleg.*, pp. 66 f., 75 f. (Eng. Trans. p. 64 f., 72 f.).

[3] *Cf.* also Delitzsch, *ZKWL.*, 1880, p. 8. [4] iv. 8. [5] *Ond.*[2] § 11, No. 26.

[6] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 77 (Eng. Trans. p. 73).

[7] *ThStW.* ii. p. 59 ff. [8] *JPTh.*, 1881, p. 646 f.

[9] *Cf. ThStW.* ii. p. 53 f., and on the other side, Kayser, *JPTh.* vii. p. 647.

[10] *Cf.* Delitzsch, *ZKWL.* i. p. 113 ff.

[11] As to these see Graf, *Gesch. BB.*, p. 36 ff.; Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] pp. 85-124 (Eng. Trans. p. 83-121). Kuen., *Ond.*[2] § 11, pp. 201-204.

led to the inference that there were no such laws then. Yet it seems to me that this is a most striking instance of the faultiness of the *argumentum e silentio*. No one denies that the festival laws of the Book of the Covenant and of Deuteronomy were in existence before the Exile. But how many celebrations corresponding to these does the history tell of? If the scanty information in the historical and prophetic books is to be the only accepted evidence of legal prescriptions having been given, then the only prescription which will stand the test is the one bearing on the Feast of Tabernacles. Putting aside a few faint hints, we seek in vain for any historical celebration of the Mazzoth Feast, or the Feast of Weeks. Where are they, seeing that the laws which are admitted to be most ancient prescribe them?[1] How is it that the Day of Atonement and the New Moon of the seventh month are not mentioned before the Exile? And this is all the more forcible seeing that you seek in vain for the Day of Atonement[2] after, as well as before, the Exile. If we abide by the rule in question, the great harvest-festival was the only one actually celebrated, and the others had no existence outside the law. But if two festivals existed merely in the law, why not more? The Feast of the New Moon is mentioned only by P, yet it played a great part in the historical life of the people.[3] Such a fact is enough to show how cautious we must be in charging P with mere invention, even on the occasions when he goes beyond J and D.

It is also asserted that the older legislation knows the festivals merely in their original import as agricultural feasts, whereas P connects them with historical events, and thus strips them of their naturalistic character. But this needs qualification to make it correct. Much dexterity is required to eliminate from the more ancient laws[4] the reference of the Mazzoth Feast to the Exodus, and to prove that this reference was brought in from Deuteronomy.[5] The agrarian character of the festival is also thoroughly

[1] Ex. xxiii. 15 f.; xxxiv. 18 ff.

[2] For further particulars on this, see especially Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 525; Delitzsch, *ZKWL.* i. p. 173 ff.

[3] *Cf.* Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 580.

[4] Ex. xxiii. 15; xxxiv. 18.

[5] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 87 ff. (Eng. Tr. p. 84 ff.)

maintained in the law of Lev. xxiii.,[1] which belongs to P. In Num. xxviii., xxix., for the first time, the agrarian character of the festival stands quite in the background, whilst the fixing of the calendar and the formal enumeration of the offerings comes to the front. But on other grounds[2] it is extremely probable that both these chapters belong to the very latest additions to P. There can be no dispute as to their exhibiting an advance upon D. Nor can we fail to recognise in them the influence of the centralisation.[3] But this does not bring us lower than the times when, as we have shown, the centralisation began to be an object aimed at by the priesthood. For it will not be maintained that such laws as are found in Num. xxviii. f. are to be taken merely as a later regulation of an earlier custom and not also as a theory.

Finally, since Graf's time,[4] special emphasis has been laid on the peculiar Passover ritual[5] in P as a proof of the later origin of the Priestly Writing. I confess that this is another proof which I am unable to deem conclusive. Suspicion is at once aroused by the fact that, at all events immediately after the Exile, the Passover does not appear to have been celebrated in strict accordance with[6] P. And the very late origin of the ritual described in Ex. xii. becomes yet more improbable when we compare it with Deuteronomy. The notice in D, forbidding

[1] It seems to me indisputable that the chapter as it now stands is from P. George (*Die ält. Jüd. Feste*, pp. 127, 143) formerly, and Wellhausen (*JDTh.* xxii. p. 431 ff.) recently, have attempted to distinguish two quite separate parts, a non-Elohistic (*vv.* 9-22 and 39-43), and an Elohistic (the remainder). But this is invalidated by the many marks of P in the supposed non-Elohistic part, and by the fact that in this case neither part would possess a complete Festival Law (Dillmann, *ExLev.*, p. 576). Nor does Kuenen's idea (*Ond.*[2] § 6, No. 27) that *vv.* 9-22 and 39-44 belongs to P^1 explain the introduction of expressions and turns elsewhere characteristic of P^2. We must therefore be content to hold that, as in other parts of these chapters so here, P adopted older laws, revised and supplemented them. The detailed analysis is a failure, as is shown by the wide differences in the attempts (Hupfeld, *Commentatio de prim. festorum ratione*, ii. p. 3 ff.; Graf, *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 78; Kayser, *Vorex. Buch*, p. 73 ff.), and especially by the extremely mechanical analysis of Horst (*Lev.* xvii. *und Hez.*, p. 26).

[2] Nöldeke, *Unters.* p. 90. Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 181.

[3] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 106 (Eng. Trans. p. 108). [4] *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 34 f.

[5] Ex. xii. 1 ff. [6] 2 Chron. xxx. 15 ff.; xxxv. 1 ff.

the celebration of the Passover[1] 'within any of thy gates,' hardly admits of any explanation save that the Passover had *until then* been kept *at* home. We are precluded from explaining the 'gates' as meaning the many places in Israel where sanctuaries stood, not only by other passages[2] where the word occurs, but also by this prohibition being applied to the Passover alone, and not to the other festivals. The pilgrimage to the high-places is forbidden with the remark that the feast is to be celebrated at the place which Yahvé shall choose:[3] the celebration of the Passover at home, with the statement that the Passover is not to be kept in the gates of Israel. For the rest, the question as to when Ex. xii. originated may still be an unsolved riddle, but the considerations now adduced seem to me to prove that the domestic celebration sprang up before the Exile. But the principal reason thus vanishes for holding the Passover law in P to be post-exilic.

Beside the three things already named, the place of divine service, the sacrificial system, and the regulation of the festivals, an evidence of the post-exilic composition of the Priestly Writing is drawn from the relation between *Priests and Levites* as presented in P.[4] This is an extremely wide subject, demanding a special and thorough investigation. But we cannot do more than treat the decisive leading points.[5]

Every one is aware how P carries out a sharp division between

[1] Deut. xvi. 5.

[2] *e.g.*, Deut. xii. 12, 17, 18, 21; xvi. 11, 14, gate = dwelling. The high-places are designated מקום, xii. 13, 2, 3 (*cf.* v. 18, xvi. 2, 6, etc.): 'place (of worship) which Yahvé chooses,' in contrast with the multitude of (כל־) 'places, which thou seest (round about thee,' xii. 13).

[3] Deut. xvi. 2, 11, 15, 16. In the ancient ritual the Mazzoth Feast, in the later ritual of D the Passover, was a Pilgrimage Festival.

[4] *Cf.* in general: Graf, *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 42-51; Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] pp. 125-157 (Eng. Trans. pp. 121-153); Maybaum, *Gesch. d. Isr. Priestertums*, 1880; Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 11, pp. 197-201. On the other side: Curtis, *The Levitical Priests*, 1877; Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 457 ff.; Kittel, *ThStW.* ii. pp. 147-169; iii. pp. 278-314; Bredenkamp, *Ges. und Proph.*, pp. 172-202; and add the articles treating of the subject in Riehm's *HWB.* and Herzog's *RE.*[2]

[5] Compare my more exhaustive exposition of the subject in the essay just named.

priests and Levites; the former alone, termed the sons of Aaron, are to minister at the altar; the Levites are subordinated to them as temple-serfs. Ezekiel carries out a similar distinction.[1] To him there are no priests save the sons of Zadok, the family that traces its descent to Solomon's chief priest; the Levites are subjected to them. Deuteronomy, on the contrary, does not carry through that sharp division. In it the priests are at the same time called Levites, and the whole tribe of Levi together is designated as entitled to the priesthood. The older historical books, too, know nothing of that strict separation between priests and Levites which P and Ezekiel carry out. Not that they esteem membership of the tribe of Levi an indifferent or superfluous point,[2] although laymen somewhat frequently hold the priest's office.[3] On the contrary, a Levitical priest is preferred to any other.[4] But nothing is said of a strict classification of the Levites according to rank and position.

These principal data have been so grouped as to seem to lead necessarily to the conclusion that P was written after the Exile. P and Ezekiel, it was urged, lie evidently on one line, D and the older historical narratives on another. The two former know of the distinction within the holy circle, the latter do not. Moreover, within the former group there is a further difference between the two who maintain the distinction: P treats the division as already effected and legally established in his day; Ezekiel announces it as a demand for something yet to be accomplished, and a demand now made for the first time. Hence it follows of itself that P rests on Ezekiel, the prophet of the Exile, and con-

[1] Ezek. xliv. 5-16.

[2] This is indeed denied by Wellhausen, *Proleg.*[2] p. 131 ff. (Eng. Tr. p. 124 ff.), in contradistinction to whom Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § ii. p. 197 f., at all events allows that Levites 'were deemed more suitable than others.' But the simple fact that Eli, according to 1 Sam. ii., is indisputably regarded as a descendant of the ancient legitimate priestly race, taken in connection with such passages as Judges xvii. 7 ff., must be admitted to prove the point.

[3] *Cf.*, among other passages, Judges vi. 26; xiii. 19; xvii. 5; 2 Sam. viii. 18; xx. 26.

[4] Judges xvii. 12 f.; xviii. 19 f., 27, 30 f.; xix. 18.

sequently is later than the Exile; and Ezekiel himself comes after D. The entire process is in three stages:—Unity of Priests and Levites; Demand for their Division; Completed Separation.

Wellhausen has treated this subject in a striking and almost exhaustive manner. Yet apt as many of his reasonings are, and strongly as one is disposed to believe that things developed just in the manner he describes, it is impossible to repress grave suspicions. How are we to account for the fact that only a mere handful of Levites returned from the Exile,[1] if their degradation had not yet been effected? That fact can only be explained on the assumption that the change had previously been made. But if it were granted that they were deterred from returning by Ezekiel's vision—although that vision gained little enough influence over the practical arrangements of life[2]—other difficulties would present themselves. How can the rise of the priesthood of the Sons of Aaron be understood if it dates merely from the time of the Return and could allege no connection with a similar pre-exilic institution to justify its existence?[3] Ezra would not have ventured to insist on this sacerdotal privilege of the sons of Aaron if it had not existed before the Exile and he had not been able to appeal to that fact.[4] For Ezekiel's authority could not be invoked on this point. In fact what he wishes is that the sons of Zadok may have the priesthood. And finally, if P is the expression of the post-exilic arrangements concerning the ministers of religion, we expect to find an actual correspondence between it and them. When we see that the arrangement of things after the return does not agree with P, that expectation is not realised. In the one case the ministers of religion consist of two classes; the sons of Aaron as priests and the rest of the Levites as their attendants. In the other, there are not only priests and Levites, but also a by no means inconsiderable class of

[1] Ezra ii. 36 ff., *cf.* viii. 15 ff.

[2] *Cf. e.g.* on Ezra iii. 3 ff.; Delitzsch in *ZKWL.* i. p. 281.

[3] Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 198: 'No writer of the time prior to Ezra knows anything about Aaron, the ancestor of the legitimate priests.'

[4] *Cf.* my discussion in *ThSt W.* iii. p. 313 f.

other temple-servants, the so-called singers, doorkeepers and Nethinim.[1]

Apart from such objections to individual points, there are difficulties of a more general nature connected with this theory of the development of the priesthood.

I cannot find that P simply takes for granted that the distinction between priests and Levites is actually completed in his time. I recognise two divergent views on the subject in this document, corresponding to its not quite homogeneous character. In the earlier stratum the separation does not appear to have entered P's field of vision. Or if it have, it has not become an object of interest and discussion to such an extent as to affect P's legislation. It is not noticeable. I consider the account of the blossoming of Aaron's rod to belong to this stratum.[2] Clearly we have here no contrast between Aaron and Levi, and therefore no Aaronic priesthood in distinction from the rest of the tribe of Levi, but simply the choice of Levi to be the priestly tribe in distinction from the rest. P is here the advocate for Levi-Aaron as against the people in general, rather than, as elsewhere, for Aaron against Levi.[3] To the same class belong all those parts of P concerning which we may believe that they contain older priestly laws, which have been so treated by the author (P^2) of our present Priestly Writing as to give it thus its specific colouring.[4] In many cases these laws are to be recognised by their still containing, or at all events having originally contained, no reference to the Aaronic

[1] Ezra ii. 41-58. See Baudissin, *Der heutige Stand. der alttest. Wissensch.* (1885), p. 51 f.

[2] Num. xvii. 16-28.

[3] See the more detailed exposition of the passage in *ThStW.* ii. p. 162 ff.

[4] Especially in Lev. i.-vii., chap. xvii. (on which *ThStW.* ii. pp. 160-162, 44 f. ; iii. p. 293 f. should be compared), also in Lev. xi.-xv., where, *e.g.*, in chap. xiii. (on which Wurster in *ZAW.* iv. p. 124, should be compared), almost every verse has 'the priest,' and only *v.* 2 has 'Aaron and his sons' as an interpolation from P^2). It is much the same in chap. xii. 14 f. The Tabernacle also, xv. 29, certainly belongs to P^2. To this ancient stratum must also be assigned the following : Lev. xxi. (as to the manner in which Aaron came into the text, *cf.* Horst, *Lev. xvii., etc.*, pp. 20, 22), large portions of Lev. xxiii. (*cf. vv.* 10 and 20), and probably xxii. 9 ff. ; but in any case large fragments of Num. v. f. (which are also reckoned as belonging to the Law of Holiness by Wurster, *ut supra*, p. 125 f.).

priesthood. In these sections there is no contrast between priests and Levites. The separation therefore is so far from being effected that it is not even thought of. The passages in question occupy the same standpoint as Deuteronomy and the historical books. Unquestionably the separation is implied in the other part of P, the portions of the whole which come from the actual author of the Priestly Writing (P^2). Where this is the case in the portions of P^2, this treatment of the subject is accounted for by what we have already said on the general character of this book. P^2 not only clothes his material as a whole in the garb of the Mosaic times; he retains this garb when he comes to speak of the relation between priests and Levites. He assumes the separation to be complete, in order to set vividly before his contemporaries the ideal at which he aims. Many passages prove that he knew it was not actually accomplished.[1]

If then P neither in its earlier nor in its later main stratum assumes that the separation of priests and Levites has been really carried out in his day, the chief reason is removed for dating this document after the Exile, at all events so far as that reason is derived from this matter of the priests. Still more is this the case if it can be shown that what has been adduced in support of that thesis from Ezekiel, Deuteronomy and the historical books, is untenable. As to Ezekiel, this can at least be made probable; as to Deuteronomy and the historical books it can be shown to be certain.

Wellhausen takes the words of the prophet Ezekiel, chap. xliv. 6-16,[2] as the starting-point of his whole discussion. And Kuenen[3] declares that the man who does not acknowledge that Ezekiel regards the degradation of the Levites as something new and previously unheard of, is to be pitied rather than refuted. Yet we

[1] Num. xvi. 8-11; Num. iii. 4, 18. On this *cf.* *ThStW.* ii. pp. 164-166, and, in opposition to Kayser, *JPTh.* vii. p. 642 f., iii. p. 293 f. On account of Num. viii. 23, compared with Ezek. xliv. 10, see *ThStW.* ii. p. 167 f. in opposition to Smend, *Ezechiel*, p. 363.

[2] Besides the writings already mentioned, *cf.* Delitzsch in *ZKWL.* i. p. 279 ff.; Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 461; Baudissin, *StKr.*, 1883, p. 839 f.; on the other side, Smend, *Ezechiel*, *in loc.*

[3] *Ond.*[2] § 11, No. 14.

believe the explanation thus rejected will eventually turn out to be the only practicable one. It agrees with the context, which does not deal in the first instance with the degradation of the Levites, but with the exclusion of aliens and the maintenance of the sanctity of the temple. It is further recommended by the circumstance that Ezekiel never represents the measure which he advocates against the Levites as anything new.[1] It is almost demanded when we bring into connection with these considerations the fact that Ezekiel has already long before taken for granted that the priests are sons of Zadok.[2] If their degradation in chap. xliv. were altogether new, it could not be looked on as understood in chaps. xl. and xliii.

The matter is still clearer in Deuteronomy. It is admitted that this work lays stress on the unity of the priests and Levites, and gives no intimation of there being a sharp distinction between them. But is it entirely unaware of that distinction? Is it really thinking only of the tribe of Levi as the priestly tribe, under the supposition that every member thereof has precisely the same rank and the same right to minister at the altar? That is neither more nor less than impossible.

The historical circumstances with which D is most intimately connected, and the whole tendency of the book, unconditionally require that separation within the tribe of Levi. The removal of the rural Levites from the high-places is one of D's chief demands. The book may say nothing about hindrances in the way of this measure, but many such must have been experienced, and many struggles and complications of every kind have ensued.[3] For the compulsory humiliation of the Levites was intended, and this certainly could not be effected so peaceably as would appear from the Book of Kings.[4] D disregards these inevitable complications as though they were not within his field of view. In precisely the same manner he treats that setting aside of the

[1] 'They shall not come near unto me,' *v.* 13, is couched in much too general terms to allow of such far-going conclusions being built on it. We should at least expect a לא עוד.

[2] Ezek. xl. 45 f., xliii. 19.

[3] See Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 459.

[4] 2 Kings xxiii. 9.

priests[1] of the high-places which he desires, as a perfectly harmless and peaceful matter, the carrying out of which is not at all likely to injure the Levites seriously. After that event, as before it, they will still be members of the great priestly tribe. It is on this latter point of view that he is continually laying stress. Hence, if the other considerations are neglected, it may seem as though D neither knew nor foresaw any distinctions within the tribe of Levi. Yet he is the very person who has evoked the chief distinction of all, and that, assuredly, not without knowing and wishing it. D's language[2] respecting the relation between the priests and Levites is so wavering and variable as almost to imply an intentional indefiniteness of expression:[3] the leading passages, however, make at least one conclusion certain. The popular notion that D gave the Levites of the sanctuaries at the high-places, who were deprived of their office and their livelihood, a full right to become at will priests at the Temple in Jerusalem,[4] finds no support in D himself. It is the same with the other notion of the complete equalisation of Levites and priests. D knows quite well how to distinguish between the Temple priests settled at Jerusalem, and the lower class of rural Levites.[5] He knows nothing about a migration to Jerusalem at their pleasure[6] and being received into the high order of Temple priests. What he considers an equitable concession to those Levites is simply this: if one of them, *now and then*, came up to Jerusalem from his home in the country, he may take part with his more exalted 'brethren' in the sacrificial worship there offered. In other

[1] That these Levites were priests of the high-places, but in the main were not idolatrous priests, see *ThStW.* iii. 288 f. On the other side (besides the authors there named), Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 327. But in my opinion it is a temporary indulgence, not a granting of equal rights, that is in question. See Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, pp. 350, 358.

[2] On this *cf.* my discussion of all D's utterances on the point, in *ThStW.* iii. pp. 278-294.

[3] Especially Deut. xviii. 1-8.

[4] *e.g.* Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 15, No. 15.

[5] At Deut. xviii. 3-5 the one, and at *vv.* 6-8, the other class is spoken of. See *ThStW.* iii. pp. 284-289; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, pp. 324-327.

[6] Thus Kayser, *JPTh.* vii. p. 640; Riehm, *HWB.*, p. 1233*b*; in *ExLev.*, p. 458, and again in *NuDtJo.*, p. 326 f., Dillmann seems to give this view the preference. Against it, besides *ThStW.* iii. p. 288, see also Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 350.

respects he continues to be what he was before, and at the end of a day or two returns to his own place.[1] He does not get his proper living hence, but from the sacrificial offerings and the benevolence of the well-to-do.

Finally, in proof of the thesis that 'Aaron does not appear in a single pre-exilic writing as the ancestor of the legitimate priests,'[2] and of the supposition connected with it, that in earlier times non-Levitical priests were the rule, the case of Zadok, the progenitor of the priests, is confidently appealed to. It is maintained that as a matter of fact he was not a Levite, but the founder of a new line, illegitimate in the eyes of the later priesthood, a priestly usurper of foreign blood.[3] In Wellhausen's opinion[4] the immediate consequence was that previous to the Exile the priests could not be called sons of Aaron because it was too well known that Zadok belonged neither to the family of Aaron nor to that of Levi. This notion also can be refuted. Zadok was as much a Levite as Abiathar and Eli, so that he was in no way a usurper: in all probability he too was descended from Aaron. But it will be better to bring forward the proof of this when we narrate in the history the events to which it belongs.[5]

2. *The Literary and Linguistic Considerations.*—Besides these archæological considerations two other points of view have been urged in proof of the post-exilic origin of P, the purely literary, and the linguistic.

Kayser and Marti specially took up the former, the literary side of the problem. Kayser[6] endeavoured 'to obtain a conclusion

[1] The words גר שם, *v.* 6, like אשר בשעריך in Deut. xiv. 27, 29; xvi. 11, 14 (*cf.* xxvi. 11 ff.), clearly point to this.

[2] So Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 15, No. 15. But as to the designation of Aaron as priest, to some extent in contrast with the whole tribe of Levi, *cf.* Deut. x. 6 ff. (E), and see also the pre-exilic passages from the law in our analysis of the sources, § 21 f.

[3] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 130 f. (Eng. Trans. p. 123 f.)

[4] *Ibid.* p. 131 (Eng. Trans. p. 124).

[5] A preliminary comparison may be made of Riehm, *HWB.*, p. 1221 f.; Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 459 f.; Bredenkamp, *Gesetz. und Proph.*, p. 180 ff.; Kittel, *ThStW.* iii. pp. 294-314.

[6] *Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels und seine Erweiterungen*, Strassburg, 1874.

as to the relative age of the various components of the Pentateuch by considerations derived purely from the history of the literature, that is, by means of quotations and allusions in the other writings of the Old Testament,' and his result was that besides D only the Yahvistic narrative and legislation were extant prior to the Exile.[1] Starting from Deuteronomy as a fixed point Kayser first compared, as to their origin, all the passages in the rest of the Hexateuch which contain resemblances to D. In this way he found that D knew and largely used the Yahvistic book (J and E), but made no reference to the Elohist (P), and therefore nowhere implied its existence.[2] Kayser then extended his inquiry to the writings of the Old Testament outside the Hexateuch, and found his former result confirmed by the pre-exilic historical books as well as by the pre-exilic prophets. Graf,[3] and then Wellhausen,[4] had already laid stress on the well-known declarations against sacrifice made by some of the prophets:[5] Kayser considered these declarations a confirmation of his view. But he discovered the positive proof of his thesis in the literary characteristics of the peculiar body of laws, Lev. xvii.-xxvi. On account of its many remarkable points of contact with Ezekiel he followed Graf[6] in ascribing it to the hand of that prophet.[7]

Marti, in his essay on the traces of the so-called Fundamental Writing of the Hexateuch found in the pre-exilic prophets of the Old Testament, strongly opposed Kayser as to the comparison of the prophetic writings with P.[8] On the one hand he opposed the explanation offered by Graf and Kayser of those prophetic utterances in which the over-estimate of sacrifices is rebuked. On the other he believed himself able to point out a number of positive references to P in prophets earlier than the Exile. Marti himself fully admits that in this second attempt he went too far.

[1] *ut supra*, p. 4 f. [2] *ut supra*, p. 148. [3] *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 69 f.
[4] *Proleg.*[2] p. 58 ff. (Eng. Trans. p. 56 ff.) [5] Amos v. 25; Jer. vii. 22 f., etc.
[6] *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 75 ff., especially 82 f.; Bertheau, *JDTh.*, 1866, p. 150 ff., and Colenso, *The Pentat.*, etc., vi. p. 1 ff., agree with him.
[7] *Vorexil. Buch*, p. 176 ff.; *cf. JPTh.*, 1881, p. 548 ff.
[8] *JPTh.*, 1880, pp. 127-161, and pp. 338-354. [But *cf.* Marti's recent *Old Test. Theology.*]

Wellhausen[1] adopted Kayser's theory of Lev. xvii.-xxvi. in the main, but agreed with Nöldeke[2] and Kuenen[3] in denying that Ezekiel was the author. Dillmann,[4] and earlier still Klostermann,[5] emphatically opposed it. Afterwards it received strong support from Horst's work on the subject.[6] Horst deems Kayser's conclusions respecting these chapters and their relation to Ezekiel—leaving aside minor variations—to be substantially proved. He agrees that with the exception of P's contributions they arose during the Exile, and believes that Ezekiel should be held to be the author. Opponents have alleged numerous discrepancies between Ezekiel and the Law of Holiness, as Klostermann[7] aptly called the Corpus. Horst is prepared to get over these by a subsidiary hypothesis: on the one hand Ezekiel himself need not have framed all these laws; he may have adopted and elaborated some; on the other hand he may have occupied himself with Lev. xvii. ff. at a much earlier time than the composition of his own book; in the interval many alterations of the legislation became necessary.[8]

Kuenen's revised *Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek*[9] supplied a strong reinforcement to Kayser and Horst, both as regards the Law of Holiness and the other points. It does indeed reject the idea of Ezekiel being the author, and agrees with Wellhausen and Reuss in thinking of a man who worked after the manner of that prophet.[10] Dillmann has recently treated the whole subject from another standpoint, and comes to entirely different conclusions in almost every particular.[11] Setting aside the parts that

[1] *JDTh.* xxii. pp. 440 f., 422-444; Bleek, *Einl.*[4] p. 173. *Cf. Proleg.*[2] p. 399 ff. (Eng. Trans., p. 376 ff.). [2] *JPTh.*, 1875, p. 355 ff. *Cf.* previously *Unters.*, p. 67 ff.

[3] *Religion of Israel*, ii. p. 190 ff. It was denied also by Reuss, *L'histoire sainte*, etc. i. p. 252 ff. [4] *ExLev.*, p. 533 ff.

[5] *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.*, 1877, p. 406 ff.; *cf.* further, Delitzsch in *ZKLW.* i. p. 617 ff.

[6] *Lev.* xvii.-xxvi. *und Hezechiel. Ein Beitrag zur Pentateuchkritik* (Colmar, 1881).

[7] Horst, *ut sup.*, p. 416. [8] *Ibid.* pp. 91, 93 f.; *cf.* p. 52 f.

[9] § 10 and § 14 f. should be specially compared.

[10] Wurster, *ZAW.* iv. p. 123, agrees with them: on the other hand Horst produces decisive traces of the priority of H to Ezekiel.

[11] *NuDtJo.*, especially pp. 605 ff., 637 ff., 644 ff., 654 ff.

belong to A, he sees in Lev. xvii.-xxvi. a work that has passed through many hands and did not form a rounded whole (p. 639). Portions of Lev. xi. and some others resemble it (640 f.) But in any case this compound (S) was used both by D and P (Dillmann's A). Accordingly it is ancient, and at all events was neither written nor compiled by Ezekiel. The conclusion alone (Lev. xxvi. 3 ff.) was retouched during the Exile (p. 646 f.). As to the relation of P to E and J, Dillmann unconditionally admits that P used E, and at least conditionally that he used J (p. 655 f.). He regards the external evidences as of subordinate value, not testifying against the earlier composition of P (p. 662), but not directly witnessing in its favour (p. 666 f.).

When I survey the course of these investigations and endeavour to form an idea of the results obtained by the inquiry which has been thus far prosecuted in the literary domain, it seems to me that our main question has not gained many sure results.

To mention first the Law of Holiness in Lev. xvii. ff.,[1] 'that compendium of the history of the literature of the Pentateuch.'[2] The manifold and striking relations with Ezekiel, which it indisputably exhibits, cannot, I think, be satisfactorily accounted for by a mere preference felt by the prophet for this section of the Torah. Klostermann's[3] carefully developed proof that the formula 'I am Yahvé,' of which both are fond, was also common in other parts of the Old Testament, in the law and the prophets, neither explains how the use of it has here become a positive mannerism nor the many other points of contact, which in Lev. xxvi. are positively overpowering.[4] The Corpus must have passed through Ezekiel's hands.

The key of the riddle seems to me to be furnished by the fact that the correspondences with Ezekiel are largely confined to the preambles and conclusions of the laws. The prophet found the substance of the laws ready to his hand and edited them in his

[1] To which Lev. xi. also probably belongs, and very likely some other passages.
[2] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 399 (Eng. Trans. p. 376). [3] *ut supra*, p. 436 ff.
[4] See Horst, *ut supra*, p. 72 ff.

own language. He contributed almost the whole of Lev. xxvi. himself. The most natural view as to the subsequent history of the collection is that soon afterwards in the Exile, a compiler who was master of P's mode of speech incorporated the collection with P, and furnished it with additions in P's manner. But if it is true, as has already been shown, that parts of the Elohistic revision decidedly point to an earlier period, it is also true that no objection can be advanced that would disprove the converse procedure. Ezekiel's revision did not come till after P's. The reason why Ezekiel chose just this part of P for a renewed revision cannot be fully explained. I hold it most probable that one of P's successors, not P himself, moulded it into its new form and that consequently it was not inserted in P till after Ezekiel's time. If Lev. xi. xvii.-xxv. were current as an independent collection of laws there is nothing remarkable in Ezekiel's taking them up and remoulding them. On the other hand, this would explain the heterogeneousness of the parts of this section.[1]

But I cannot admit that I am convinced by Horst's[2] and Kuenen's[3] attempts to prove that the Law of Holiness, in its groundwork, depends on Deuteronomy. The coincidences are of such a nature as to afford far more ground for concluding that D depends on our Corpus.[4] If then the Law of Holiness must also have passed through Ezekiel's hands, its kernel nevertheless contains pre-Deuteronomic and fairly ancient laws.

It also seems to me that after Kayser's demonstration it is impossible to deny the dependence of P on J and E, as used frequently to be done. So much the less, however, can I attach any importance to the arguments respecting P which are drawn either from the silence or from the utterances of the pre-exilic prophets. For the general conclusion on this question I refer to the propositions already laid down,[5] and restrict myself here to a

[1] On this see Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 638 f.
[2] Horst, *ut supra*, p. 55 f.
[3] *Ond.*[2] § 14, No. 6; § 15, No. 8 ff.
[4] On this see Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, pp. 605 ff., 644 f.
[5] *Cf.* p. 102, No. 3.

few leading passages.[1] Amos,[2] for instance, in order to put down the exaggerated estimate of the sacrificial system, recalls the fact that Israel brought no sacrifices to Yahvé during the forty years in the wilderness. But we can hardly infer much from this as regards the sacrificial legislation. The only inference his words allow is that Amos knew nothing about a cultus actually established in the wilderness. They admit of absolutely no conclusion as to whether he knew and disagreed with P, or was unacquainted with him. Even if the second alternative were correct this would not show that P could not have been extant. The priestly ritual may possibly not have been accessible to the shepherd of Tekoa. But it seems by far the more probable supposition that Amos meant to say reproachfully that the idolatrous people,[3] even before they left the desert, failed to observe the commands respecting sacrifice given by Moses. When, moreover, Jeremiah[4] expressly cries: 'I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices,' it does not seem to me quite certain that the usual interpretation will suffice. It makes these words to be simply a very strong expression of the general idea that sacrifices are unessential, and the Sacrificial Torah consequently unessential in comparison with moral conduct. In the face of other very outspoken declarations concerning sacrifice made by the prophets, I cannot deem this explanation an impossible one. It gains in probability when we consider that, taken literally, the words 'nothing concerning sacrifices' would imply that Jeremiah also repudiated, as non-extant, the sacrificial ordinances in the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy.[5] If it is thought that this difficulty can be got

[1] For the rest *cf.* Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 58 ff. (Eng. Trans. p. 56 ff.), and on this *ThStW.* ii. p. 49 ff.

[2] v. 25. On this see Graf, *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 69; Kayser, *Vorexil Büch.*, p. 161 f; Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 59 (Eng. Trans. p. 56). Also Bredenkamp, *Ges. und Proph.*, p. 83 ff.; Steiner in the Commentary on the passage. [3] *Cf.* the allusion in *v.* 26.

[4] vii. 22 ff. See Graf's Commentary *in loc.*; *Gesch. Büch.*, p. 70; Kayser, *Vorexil Büch.*, p. 166 f.; Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 61 (Eng. Trans. p. 58); Cheyne, *Life of Jeremiah*, pp. 119, 157. On the other side, Bredenkamp, *Ges. und Proph.*, p. 105 ff.

[5] On this see Bredenkamp, *ibid.* pp. 109, 111; Orelli, *Jesaja und Jeremia, in loc.*

over there remains the more obvious explanation that Jeremiah intentionally ignored the priestly Torah:[1] this would preclude the necessity of concluding that P was actually not extant. The only requisite presupposition is, that P had not obtained public recognition in Jeremiah's time.[2]

On the other hand, it is impossible that there should be entire agreement as to P's relation to D. We have already[3] laid down the general lines on which opinion should run, especially as regards the facts of the case. With regard to the older strata of P, Dillmann[4] appears to me to be correct in pointing out that D frequently refers to P, even without naming it. For the later portions of the Priestly Writing, however, such as the portions of Lev. xvii. 4 ff., which belong to P, or Num. xxviii. f., we come to the post-Deuteronomic period.

It still remains to glance at the proofs drawn from the *language* of the Priestly Writing. V. Ryssel[5] was the first to investigate it thoroughly. He divides the history of the Hebrew language into three periods. The first extends to the year 700. The second closes with the end of the sixth century. The third reaches from the beginning or middle of the fifth century to the cessation of the Old Testament literature. With reference to the Priestly Writing, he comes to the conclusion that considerable groups of laws[6] belonging to it bear a comparatively recent stamp, but are to be ascribed to the second of these three periods and to its first, pre-exilic, half. The rest of the laws, and the narrative from Gen. i. to Exod. vi., Ryssel ascribes to the first period of the language, and he actually believes that they

[1] Which is not excluded by xvii. 26 (Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 61; Eng. Trans. p. 59), if we compare such utterances as Jer. viii. 8; xviii. 18; Isa. xxix. 13. On this see *ThStW.* ii. p. 50.

[2] Bredenkamp, *ut supra*, p. 110, explains it in the sense of על דברי, etc., which would be a much simpler solution.

[3] P. 101, No. 2. [4] *NuDtJo.*, p. 605 ff.

[5] *De elohistae pentateuchici sermone*, Lips., 1878. *Cf.* already Wellh. *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 397 ff.

[6] Exod. xxv.-xxxi., xxxv.-xl.; Lev. viii.-x. 27; Num. i.-x., xv.-xix., xxvi. ff. On a certain inconsistency in his statements see Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 15, No. 11.

must be placed at the very threshold of Hebrew literature.[1] Giesebrecht,[2] in his fresh investigation of the subject, has raised serious objections to Ryssel's method. He wishes the books composed between 536 and 450 (Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi), not those written after 450 (Ezra and Nehemiah), to be first placed in comparison with P. Giesebrecht thus reaches the conclusion that P does not belong to the linguistic period which ends with 700, but that, on the contrary, the points of contact with P become increasingly numerous in the seventh, and especially in the sixth century, P being thus seen to be more recent than Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah. If there are phenomena which point to the Silver Age of the literature, it must be remembered that the Elohist was a scholar conversant with the older literature, and careful to write a pure, non-Aramaic Hebrew.[3] Well-founded objections have, however, been raised against Giesebrecht's assumptions and conclusions, particularly by Driver,[4] so that even Kuenen[5] is obliged to own that the history of the language cannot decide the question, and up to the present has yielded only the negative result of proving it useless to attempt dating P early on linguistic grounds. This carries with it the admission that they cannot be adduced as independent supports of the Grafian Theory.[6] And if the theory has not yet approved itself to us as true, the result derived from the history of the language possesses no intrinsic force to prove it.

3. *Result.*—We are now in a position to sum up the conclusions that have been reached, and pronounce our judgment on the probable date of the composition of P. It has already become abundantly evident that the Priestly Writing is not a homogeneous work, and consequently that its composition cannot be referred to one and the same period throughout. A distinction must therefore

[1] *Ut supra*, p. 82.

[2] *Zur Hexateuchkritik ZAW.* i. p. 177 ff. See also Kayser in *JPTh.* vii. p. 362. On Ryssel's distinction between Gen. i.-Ex. vi. and the rest of P, see Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 15, No. 21.

[3] *Ut supra*, p. 269.

[4] *Journal of Philology*, xi. p. 201 ff. *Cf.* also Steiner in *Theol. Zeitsch. aus der Schweitz*, iv. (1887), p. 422 ff.

[5] *Ond.*[2] § 15, No. 11.

[6] See further Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 663 ff.

be drawn between its various strata. The oldest stratum, partly containing the groundwork of the Law of Holiness, and partly that of P^2, may justifiably be placed in a comparatively early period, at any rate from that of Solomon downwards (tenth and ninth century). Originally it existed in the form of detached documents, but these are now connected together so as to form the oldest groundwork of the Priestly Writing: the brief designation P^1 will serve for it. The second stratum comes from the actual author of the Priests' Book (P^2), and brings us into the eighth century. It contains the priestly narrative, the revised form of the matter adopted from P^1, and so edited as to support the Aaronic priesthood, the centralisation of the cultus at the sanctuary (the Tabernacle), and a number of fresh legal ordinances. We have shown above that it is not to be dated later than Hezekiah. From Lev. xvii. ff. it is certain that the reviser of the Law of Holiness (P^3) did not live previously to Hezekiah and the Captivity of the Northern Kingdom. Hence the later portions of P run fairly parallel to Deuteronomy, and possibly come as low down as Jeremiah's time. The last supposition will at any rate be allowable, if, as we have held probable, a certain amount of opposition towards P can be detected in this prophet's attitude.

When the people went into Exile they took the completed law-book with them, and it was wrought up with the other extant legal writings into our present Hexateuch, in, or rather after, the Exile. When this occurred the reviser of the Hexateuch (R^h) may have made many additions, some his own, others taken from sources related to P. Isolated additions were made afterwards.

During the Exile or a little before it a reviser (R^d) who worked in harmony with D's views had prepared the way for R^h by connecting E and J with each other as well as with D and D^1 and by partially re-editing them. Especially in our present Book of Joshua he handles his materials in a much freer manner than R^h, and thus shows himself to have been the earlier of the two.

II. THE REMAINING SOURCES.

§ 11.

Besides the great work dealing with the earliest history of Israel which we possess in the first six books of the Old Testament, there are, of course, scattered notices in the rest of the Old Testament which throw light on this portion of Hebrew history. But, with few exceptions, they are merely casual, fragmentary statements, requiring no independent discussion of the sources whence they are derived. Each must be considered in its own place.

Israel has not left behind any kind of contemporary or later monumental inscriptions bearing on this period. No such monuments have been found, and there is no good reason for expecting that any will hereafter be discovered. Nor do we possess any monument belonging to or dealing with that period from the hands of the Phœnicians or other neighbours of Israel.[1]

It is otherwise with Egypt and Babylon. Both the cuneiform inscriptions of Babylon and the Egyptian monuments of the most varied kinds reach much further back than the period now in question. In the later course of its history Israel was in many ways brought into momentous relations with the Babylonian-Assyrian Empire on the one hand and Egypt on the other. The monuments of those peoples furnish very important information concerning these relations. And Hebrew tradition tells of occasions when Israel was brought into fateful contact with the peoples of the Nile and Euphrates valleys in the very earliest times. Hence we cannot do less than cherish the expectation that the contemporary historical documents of those peoples may throw some light on the history of the beginnings of Israel. The exposition of our subject must show whether the expectation is fulfilled.

This is not the place for a fuller statement respecting the

[1] On a Phœnician stone which is said to have been seen in ancient times, see below, § 28.

general character of these foreign monuments. We must refer to the works which treat expressly of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Assyrian history, especially to the volumes in this series dealing with these subjects.[1]

The small contributions which later authors, writing in the Greek language, make to the knowledge of this period will also be more appropriately dealt with each in its own place. Josephus would naturally be first thought of, because in his Archæology he gives a continuous history of the Hebrews, and thus supplies a parallel narrative to that of the Bible. But his account is, in almost all points, marked by two characteristics. It is unduly embellished and exaggerated till it becomes fabulous. It is coloured with an intentional bias in favour of the Levitical and hierarchical. The consequence is that, at any rate so far as this period is concerned, it nowhere bears the character of an original document which might be set over against the Old Testament.[2] But his appeal to Manetho in the work against Apion will hereafter claim a minuter investigation.

[1] Wiedemann, *Ägyptische Geschichte*, i. ii., 1884; Tiele, *Babylonisch-assyrische Geschichte*, i. 1886.

[2] Respecting him see Reuss in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.*, ii. 31, p. 104 ff.: Baumgarten in *JDTh.*, 1864, p. 616 ff.; Hausrath in Sybel's *Hist. Ztschr.*, 1864, p. 285 ff.; Schürer in *PRE.*[2] vii. p. 109 ff.; and especially Ranke, *Weltgesch.* iii. 2, p. 12 ff.

B. HISTORY OF THE PERIOD.

CHAPTER I

THE PATRIARCHAL AGE

In the following pages we first give a complete presentation of the material furnished by Biblical tradition for chapters i. and ii., *i.e.* for the historical narrative of the Pentateuch.[1] We then append a detailed examination into the historical reliableness of each narrative. For all details respecting the age and the reciprocal relations of the main sources of the Hexateuch, the conclusions already reached are taken for granted. Our attention is here fixed on the internal connection of each source and the mode in which each has used and reproduced the historical material. The analysis which we have given shows the present state of the inquiry into the sources of the Hexateuch. By this arrangement I hope to be of service even to the reader who is not conversant with the tedious analysis of the sources. If any one is anxious to form a judgment on the historical trustworthiness of the old Israelite tradition it is of primary importance that he become acquainted with the various strata of that tradition which run independently alongside of or are built up on one another, seeing each of these in its own connection and apart from the rest. This applies to every reader, whatever his standpoint, whatever his view of Israelite history as a whole, whether he be professed historian or layman. Thus only will it

[1] This method is not so suitable for the Book of Joshua, because the revision has here been carried out with incomparably greater thoroughness.

be possible to form our own judgment as to the mutual relation and the value of those strata of tradition.

I. THE TRADITION IN THE SOURCES

§ 12. E's *Narrative.*

Nothing,[1] or at most only a few scanty remains[2] belonging to this source, have been preserved among those dealing with the primæval history. Nor does it give us in Genesis any information as to the origin and descent of Abraham, the ancestor of the Israelites. Neither his paternal home, nor his journey to Canaan, nor his marriage with Sarah, nor his relation to Lot,[3] is definitely stated. Not till we reach Josh. xxiv. 2 f. do we come upon a brief but valuable notice on these matters. The first of the larger connected accounts of Abraham, indubitably belonging to this source, is contained in chap. xx. But the opening of the narrative clearly indicates that its author has previously given some information respecting Abraham.[4] Possibly a few stray portions of the account once contained in this source are preserved in our present text at xii., 6*a* and 8*a*, and almost certainly there are a few members of it in chap. xv. And although the indubitably very ancient fragment, Gen. xiv., did not originate with our author, but came from an older source of which we have no other knowledge, many indications point to the conclusion that the Elohist admitted it into his book.

1. The following, then, is E's picture of Abraham. We find Abraham wandering up and down in the land of Canaan as a nomad chief. He has immigrated hither from a distant land.[5] Sometimes he pitches his tent at Shechem, sometimes he turns towards Bethel,[6] building altars and founding sanctuaries[7] at both

[1] According to Wellhausen, *JDTh.* xxi. p. 407 ff.; Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 8, No. 8.

[2] According to Dillm. *Gen.*[4] p. xii. (less decisively *Gen.*[5] p. xii.).

[3] The statement at xiv. 12 is a gloss.

[4] Gen. xx. 1: 'And Abraham journeyed from thence.' If, as is probable, chap. xiv. was adopted by E (*cf.* xiv. 3), the addition מִשָּׁם also (against Dillm.) belongs to E.

[5] Gen. xx. 13.

[6] Gen. xii. 6*a*, 8*a*.

[7] Doubtless this must be regarded as the meaning of these notices in E also, even though the present form of xii. 6-8 belong to J.

places. Sometimes he dwells in the Negeb or under the terebinths of Mamre, at Hebron.[1] Lot is his relative. There is an offensive and defensive alliance between him and the Amorites of the Hebron district.

After a vassalage of twelve years' duration the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Bela have rebelled against their oppressor, Chedorlaomer, king of Elam. Chedorlaomer and his allies march against the Canaanites by a circuitous route through the south. In the Vale of Siddim there is a battle. The Canaanite kings are beaten and their towns plundered. The victors march off to the north with a rich booty of men, cattle, and goods.

Amongst the captives is Lot, Abraham's nephew, a resident in Sodom. As soon as Abraham hears of his fate he arms three hundred and eighteen trained men, all of them home-born slaves. He summons also the militia of his Amorite allies,[2] and pursues the Elamite marauders. In a nocturnal attack he surprises those of the Elamites who have remained farthest in the rear, apprehending no danger, drunk with victory. They are beaten, and Abraham pursues them as far as Hobah. Prisoners and spoil are taken from them and brought back to Sodom. The king of Sodom offers Abraham a rich reward. Magnanimously and proudly he refuses it, but accepts the benediction pronounced by Melchizedek, king of a Canaanite town, whose religion resembles his own, whose god is El Elyon.[3]

At some indefinite time after these events God appears to Abraham in a vision and promises him a great reward.[4] Abraham incredulously replies to God: 'What wilt Thou give me, seeing I go childless and he that shall be possessor (heir) of my house is Damascus of Eliezer (=Eliezer of Damascus)?' But God leads him outside the tent and shows him the countless stars. His seed

[1] Gen. xii. 9, E [or R] (not J, see below); xiv. 13. [2] Gen. xiv. 24.

[3] Gen. xiv. 1-16, 21-24, omitting reviser's additions and glosses. Also the main portion of *vv.* 17-20, but probably without Shalem and the tenths.

[4] Gen. xv. 1: so it ran in the portion of this verse which belongs to E. According to others, the verse belongs to J, but this is a mistake.

shall be like them in number. Abraham believes, and God reckons his faith to him for righteousness. In more or less close connection with this, E no doubt described a covenanting of God with Abraham, but of this there remain only a few touches, which have been worked into the text of J.[1]

From the terebinths of Mamre Abraham moves on to the Negeb proper, the south of Canaan, where he settles in Gerar. Abimelech, the king of Gerar, takes from him his wife Sarah, whom he has represented to be his sister. God appears to Abimelech in a dream, and threatens him with death because Sarah is Abraham's wife and Abraham himself a prophet. Abimelech, seized with fear, reproaches Abraham for his misleading conduct. Abraham excuses himself on the ground of Sarah's being his half-sister as well as his wife. They had agreed together when they left his paternal home that she should call herself his sister. Abimelech restores Sarah, giving her rich presents by way of compensation. To Abraham also he gives rich presents, and free permission to dwell in the country round Gerar. On Abraham's intercession God relieves Abimelech and his wives of a secret ailment which had prevented the king from injuring Sarah.[2]

No account of Sarah's long barrenness and Ishmael's being born of Hagar is contained in our source, but it is necessarily implied by the sequel. The same is true of Isaac's birth. The only words from E preserved in the present context are those which give the peculiar explanation of the name Isaac: 'Sarah said, God hath prepared laughter for me.'[3] The child grows, and Abraham makes a feast on the day that he is weaned.[4]

At this feast Sarah sees Hagar's son[5] playing in youthful light-heartedness.[6] Her maternal jealousy is aroused, and she

[1] Gen. xv. The elements of this chapter derived from E are as follows: from E alone, *vv.* 2, 5; belonging both to E and J, *vv.* 1 and 6; probably also some words in *vv.* 9 and 12, and very likely in *v.* 18. See below, § 13, No. 2.

[2] Gen. xx. 1-17. *V.* 18 is from R, and does not agree with *v.* 6.

[3] Against Dillm.[4], p. 266 f. ([5], p. 278), *cf.* Budde, *Bibl. Urgesch.*, pp. 215. 224,

[4] Only xxi. 6*a*, 8 here belong to E.

[5] The name Ishmael is not mentioned, but was originally introduced and explained in *v.* 17; *cf.* Dillm.[5], p. 281.

[6] Nothing is said about mockery.

begins to be anxious about her son's future inheritance. She wishes the mother and son to be sent away. Abraham is not at first inclined to comply, but God leads him to carry out Sarah's will. The son of the bondwoman is also to become a people.

Abraham puts the lad with some food on Hagar's shoulder and sends them away. She wanders in the wilderness of Beersheba, and when the water in the water-skin is exhausted she casts the lad under a shrub and removes to some distance that she may not see him die. But the angel of God calls to her out of heaven, bidding her be of good courage and put her trust in God. Her eyes are miraculously opened so that she sees a well of water and gives her lad drink. He remains here and becomes a dweller in the desert and an archer, the true father of the Ituræan and Kedarene bowmen. His mother, herself an Egyptian, takes for him an Egyptian wife.[1]

At this time Abimelech's attention is again attracted by Abraham's prosperity, and he proposes a covenant with the patriarch. Abraham is willing, but desires that a quarrel over a well which his servants have dug should first be settled. Abimelech defends his own conduct. The well is assigned to Abraham, the agreement is made, and the place receives the name Beersheba, Well of the Oath. Abimelech[2] returns to Gerar[3] with Phicol, the captain of his host, who had accompanied him.

The last portion of our narrator's very fragmentary history of Abraham is chapter xxii.[4] Its fundamental idea corresponds with xv. 5 f. Isaac, the only son of his old age, who has grown into a young man in the meantime, is to serve as the touchstone of Abraham's obedience and faith. He is to take and sacrifice him upon 'one of the mountains' which God will tell him of.[5]

[1] Gen. xxi. 9-21. [2] Gen. xxi. 22-32.

[3] So, probably, in the original text of E. The reading, 'in the land of the Philistines,' is a harmonising interpolation introduced by R because of chap. xxvi.

[4] The main stem of the chapter belongs to E, but there are many traces of J: hence it is natural to think that J also had an account of this event.

[5] Wellhausen (*JDTh.*, xxi. p. 410) conjectures that the original name was אֹ֫ חמרים; Dillmann[5], p. 287, gives אֹ֫ האמרי as probable.

Abraham rises up with Isaac and sets out, and on the third day sees the place afar off which God had told him of. He leaves the servants behind, and goes to the place with Isaac to sacrifice him. At the last moment God's voice is heard, bidding him hold his hand, teaching him that God does not wish for human sacrifices, but has tested Abraham's readiness to submit to His will.[1]

2. In its present condition our source has but little to tell us of Isaac's history. It would almost seem that originally the document was in much the same state. Only on this supposition can we understand R's endeavour to supply a little more information, which is clearly to be traced in chap. xxvi. This chapter contains matter which originally stood in J, and other matter which undoubtedly is due to R's own imagination. But it has also constituents which irresistibly remind us of E and are taken almost literally from him, although they did not occupy the same position in that source as here. R has here repeated parts of E's history of Abraham, modifying them slightly as his object required.[2]

Hence hardly anything more is said about Isaac's own life. The story takes up the fortunes of his sons. Isaac is now regarded simply as the father of his two sons. Their birth is narrated in a couple of verses which at least in part must belong to our author.[3] They are twins. The first is of a ruddy colour (Edom), and his entire body is covered with hair (Seir), as with a hairy mantle; his name is Esau (hairy). The second is called Jacob (heel-holder), because he held back his brother by the heel when they were born. Esau becomes a hunter in the fields and therefore his father's darling, for Isaac 'loved venison.' Jacob, a quiet man, remaining in the tents, is his mother's[4] favourite.

[1] Gen. xxii. 1-13, except isolated expressions in *vv.* 2 and 11, and probably also in *v.* 13.

[2] Obviously this seems to be the case in *vv.* 26-33, except *v.* 27. It is similar in *v.* 15, xviii. 7 ff., only that R here goes to work with still greater freedom.

[3] Gen. xxv. 24, 27 f., common to E and J; xxv. 26*a*, E (against Budde, p. 217).

[4] Whether the name Rebekah occurred in E is not guaranteed, but the circumstances of the case make it probable.

With this we may almost be said to take our leave of Isaac. No doubt our source in its original form possessed a more complete account of him. But in our present text the revision has interwoven it so closely with a similar narrative of J's that it is difficult to set forth consecutively the parts due to the individual authors.[1] We must confine ourselves to the mention of a few characteristics.[2] E at all events told, though with many an additional trait, how Isaac at the end of his life commissioned Esau to bring him a dainty dish, for he would fain give him his blessing ere dying. Their mother wished to divert the blessing in favour of her beloved Jacob, and takes the curse upon herself. She gives Esau's raiment to Jacob. He goes in to his father and represents himself to be Esau, whereupon he is blessed with dew of heaven and fatness of the earth and abundance of corn and new wine. Then comes Esau, learns what has happened, and weeps immoderately. Esau meditates revenge. Their mother bids Jacob flee to Laban. From this it is evident that E originally must at least have said something about Isaac's marriage and Rebekah's relationship to Laban. But it is more probable that he gave a detailed narrative which R has suppressed or was not acquainted with.

3. *Jacob* now becomes the subject of the story, which flows again more copiously in dealing with him.

Jacob leaves home and sets out for the East.[3] On the way he spends the night on a stone. There he sees in a dream a ladder joining earth to heaven. The angels of God ascend and descend on it. He believes this to be the gate of heaven and calls the place Bethel. He anoints the stone with oil and makes of it a maṣṣeba. Moreover Jacob vows that if he return home in safety the maṣṣeba shall become a temple, and the tenth of all God's gifts be given to it.[4] Then he resumes his journey 'to the land of the sons of the east.'[5]

[1] Gen. xxvii.

[2] Probably the following belong to E: xxvii. 1*b*, 4, 11, 13 (part of 15), 18, 21-23, 28, 30*b*, 33*b*, 34, 42.

[3] According to xxix. 1 this idea stood in place of xxviii. 10.

[4] Gen. xxviii. 11 f., 17 f., 20, 21*a*, 22.

[5] Gen. xxix. 1.

Our narrator certainly gave a fuller account of Jacob's arrival and experiences there than is found in the present text of chap. xxix. f. But the editors seem to have preferred in many respects the prophetical description of J to the more popular one of E.

Jacob proffers his services to Laban. They arrange that the reward for his seven years' service shall be Laban's younger and more beautiful daughter Rachel, with whom he has fallen in love. At the expiration of the time Jacob demands his wife. Laban substitutes the older daughter Leah. Jacob finds himself deceived. Laban mockingly[1] proposes that he shall serve another term of years for Rachel. He does so.

Rachel is at first barren, and gives her handmaid Bilhah to Jacob. She bears Dan and Naphtali. Leah, who has previously borne children to Jacob,[3] now has Issachar, Zebulun, and a daughter Dinah. Rachel, by God's blessing, bears Joseph.[4]

Jacob is now seized with home-sickness. Laban will not let him go, but wishes to hear the terms on which he will continue to serve him.[5] Jacob states his terms and remains.[6] God blesses him, and the class of animals which he has stipulated shall be his wages multiplies exceedingly. Laban several times alters the conditions, but it always turns to Jacob's advantage. Weary of the fraud and summoned in a dream by the God of Bethel, Jacob resolves to flee homewards. He sends for his two wives to come to the field and they fall in with his plan. Advantage is taken of Laban's absence at a sheep-shearing. Thus 'did Jacob deceive the heart of Laban the Aramæan;' but Rachel steals his teraphim.[7]

Laban does not overtake him till he is far beyond the Euphrates on the mountain-range of Gilead. A vision of the night forbids him to lay hands on Jacob. Laban merely demands

[1] The excuse, *v.* 26, is from J, or more probably from R (against Dillmann).
[2] Gen. xxix. 15*a*-23, 25, 27 f., 30. [3] According to Gen. xxx. 1, 17.
[4] Gen. xxx. 1-3*a*, 6, 8, 17-20*a*, 20*c*, 24*a*.
[5] Gen. xxx. 26, 28 (with Dillm. against Wellh.).
[6] To be gathered from Gen. xxxi. 7, 41.
[7] Gen. xxxi. 2, 4-9, 11, 13-17, 19-21. *Vv.* 10 and 12 are from R.

the restoration of his gods. Whoever is in possession of these must die. Laban searches the tents, but Rachel is able to save herself by a stratagem. Jacob is wroth, and bitterly reproaches his father-in-law. Laban is touched and ashamed, and proposes a covenant with him.[1]

He[2] raises a maṣṣeba on the spot: Jacob piles up a mound (*gal*) of stones. Here they hold the covenant feast. The mound is to be witness (*ed*). Hence the mountain-mass is called Gilead.[3] Jacob continues his journey and sees the camp of the angels (Mahanaim).[4]

Nothing is now to be dreaded except Esau's revenge. Jacob sends messengers to him to Edom with rich presents in separate companies.[5] He places his household and cattle on the farther side of the Jabbok, but himself remains on this side of the stream.[6] From the source before us we do not now[7] learn anything about what he did or what happened to him here. But in all probability it once contained a quite similar account to the one J gives of Jacob's struggle with God. In place of this there immediately follows a brief description of the meeting with Esau, which passes off in a perfectly friendly manner. The gifts which Esau has received[8] in the meantime are accepted by him at Jacob's special request. Jacob safely reaches the neighbourhood of Shechem, where he buys land and raises[9] a maṣṣeba.[10]

Starting hence he journeys up and down the land as a nomad, going first to Bethel to fulfil the vow he formerly made there. He builds an altar there and gives the place its name.[11] After a short

[1] Gen. xxxi. 22-24, except 25, 27.

[2] *V.* 45, Laban as subject instead of Jacob.

[3] *V.* 45 f. (against Wellh. Dillm.), 48-50 (except 48*b*, 49); also 53 f., chap. xxxii. 1.

[4] Gen. xxxii. 2 f.

[5] Gen. xxxii. 4, 14*b*-22.

[6] Gen. xxxii. 24, 25*a*.

[7] Wellhausen, *JDTh.* xxi. p. 434, also agrees with this; Dillmann, *in loc.* does not.

[8] Gen. xxxiii. 11.

[9] Probably to be preferred to *mizbeach* on account of the verb.

[10] Gen. xxxiii. 4*b*, 5*b*, 11. Parts of 19 f.

[11] Gen. xxxv. 1, 3, 7. Possibly *vv.* 2 and 4 also belong to this (Wellh. xxi. p. 437 f.); *cf.* Josh. xxiv. 14 ff.: yet we might also think of an extract from P by R.

interval he moves on farther. Rachel dies near Ephrath in giving birth to Benjamin. There too Jacob sets up a maççeba.[1]

4. The history of *Joseph.* As a youth of seventeen years old Joseph tends his father's flocks along with his brethren. By telling tales to his father he makes himself hated by his brothers.[2] This hatred is aggravated by the vain dreams which his father rebukes but thinks a great deal of.[3] One day Jacob calls Joseph and sends him to his brothers. When they see him they resolve to kill the dreamer. They will give out that a wild beast has devoured him. Reuben, wishing to save him and restore him to his father, advises them not to shed blood but to cast him into a pit. Falling in with this counsel they strip Joseph of his coat, cast him into the pit, and go away to eat food.[4]

Meanwhile there passes by a company of Midianite merchants. They take Joseph out of the pit and bring him to Egypt. But when Reuben goes back to the pit and fails to find Joseph he returns weeping to his brethren. They take Joseph's coat, dip it in blood, and bring it to their father. Jacob recognises his son's coat, and mourns for his death. The Midianites sell Joseph in Egypt to Potiphar, one of Pharaoh's eunuchs, and chief of his executioners (palace-guard). Joseph becomes this man's servant and is soon set by him over his house and property.[5]

After some time Pharaoh is wroth with two of his eunuchs, the chief baker and the cupbearer. They are put in prison in the house of the chief of the executioners. Joseph is told off to attend on them (as Potiphar's slave, not as a prisoner). He interprets

[1] Gen. xxxv. 16-20.

[2] Against Dillmann, *Gen.*[4] p. 372 ff., also *Gen.*[4] p. 386 ff. The garment with sleeves indeed belongs to J. But the garment and the special love of his father would only excite envy; whereas the tale-telling is the likely cause of the hatred. Hence the sleeved garment, the envy and the love, belong to J. The hatred and the tale-telling accordingly are seen to be E's, and to him, for other reasons, the dreams also are to be assigned.

[3] Gen. xxxvii. 2*a* and *c* (יוסף to בצאן and from ויבא onwards), 4*b*-10, 11*b*.

[4] *Vv.* 13*b* (from לכה), 19 f. (except: 'and cast into a pit,') 22, 23*aba*, 24, 25*aα*.

[5] Gen. xxxvii. 28*abβ*, 29-31, parts of 32 and 33, 34, the three last words of 35, 36. In chap. xxxix. a few words in *v.* 4 (וישרת אתו) and *v.* 5 f.

their strange dreams and his interpretation is marvellously fulfilled.[1] Two years later Pharaoh also has remarkable dreams which no one in Egypt can interpret for him. The cupbearer, who, as Joseph predicted, has been set free in the meanwhile, remembers the chief executioner's bondman and mentions him to Pharaoh. He is sent for, and explains Pharaoh's dreams as prognosticating the immediate coming of a time of great plenty which will be succeeded by a period of famine. Joseph goes on to advise that in the years of superfluity the fifth part of the grain be taken up and kept in storehouses for the time of need.[2]

Pharaoh perceives that the spirit of God is in Joseph. He makes him the first man in the kingdom, intrusts him with the royal finger-ring, clothes him in garments of byssus, and places a chain of gold about his neck. He confers on him the title of Zaphenath-paneah, explained by Jerome as meaning *creator mundi*, and certainly bearing some such sense. He gives him Asenath, daughter of one of the priests, to wife. All happens as Joseph had announced. Himself carries out the plan he had proposed. His wife bears to him Manasseh and Ephraim. The years of famine gradually draw nigh, and are felt far beyond the bounds of Egypt.[3]

Jacob thereupon sends his sons, with the exception of Benjamin, to buy corn in Egypt. They fall on their faces before Joseph. He recognises them, and remembers his dreams, but at first treats them unkindly. They are spies, he says, and to prove the truth of their declarations they must bring their youngest brother from home to him. Simeon shall remain as surety in Joseph's hands, and the rest, supplied with corn, may go home. They consent, with a heavy heart, and admonished by Reuben, they see their guiltiness in the fate which has overtaken them. Joseph has their money put in their sacks. They reach home and bring the bad news to

[1] Gen. xl. 1*aa*, 2, 3*a*, 4-22, excepting small additions in *vv.* 5 and 15, made by R from J.

[2] Gen. xli. 1-16, 25-36, leaving out small additions from J in *vv.* 7, 31, 34 f.

[3] Gen. xli. 37-40, 42, 43*a*, 45 f., 47 f., 51 f., parts of 53-57.

Jacob. He complains: 'Joseph is no more; Simeon is no more; of Benjamin ye will bereave me.' Reuben pledges his two sons that he will bring Benjamin back to him in safety.[1]

And now that E has spoken so fully, J comes in again, so that to him alone we owe almost the entire account of the second journey. Only a couple of E's statements have been preserved.[2] Jacob, with profound anxiety, allows Benjamin to go with his brothers. Joseph brings Simeon out to them. From the terminology which is strictly adhered to in other parts of the context we are justified in concluding that the designations of the oldest and youngest brothers[3] in chap. xliv. show that in this chapter also there are traces of a narrative by E of the subsequent events in Egypt.

Not till the solemn manifestation scene does R again make full use of both sources. At the outset E once more forms the foundation. Joseph dismisses his attendants, that he may make himself known to his brethren. At the same time he comforts his terrified brethren, telling them that it is God who has sent him hither to be the preserver of his family during the five remaining years of famine. They are to hasten and invite their father to Egypt. The news reaches Pharaoh, who also bids Jacob and his sons come to Egypt. They shall eat the fat of the land, and shall have waggons from Egypt to carry their wives and children. They return home laden with gifts, and bring the message to Jacob. He cannot believe until he sees Joseph's Egyptian waggons.[4]

In Beersheba, where, according to E, Jacob at this time dwelt,[5] he offers a sacrifice to the God of his father, and is encouraged by a nocturnal vision to go to Egypt, because he will there become a great nation. Thence, too, shall he return. Thus encouraged, he resolves to set out with his household. When they are come Joseph provides for their sustenance.[6]

At this point R inserts, in what is now a somewhat unsuitable

[1] Gen. xlii. 1, 2*b*-4*a*, 5, 6*c*, 7*aa*, 7*b*-26, 29-37.
[2] Gen. xliii. 14, 23*c*.
[3] Especially in *v.* 12; possibly also in *vv.* 2, 23, 26. Against Wellh. and Dillm.
[4] Gen. xlv. 1*b*, 3, 4*ab*, 5*aβ*, 5*b*-9, 11 f., 15-27.
[5] Dillm.[6] p. 428
[6] Gen. xlvi. 1*b*-5 (except Israel, *v.* 2); xlvii. 12.

connection, an account of Joseph's services to the land of Egypt.[1] It is so compounded of J and E that we cannot assign the constituents to their respective authors. All the money in Egypt is paid away for corn. Joseph then induces the people to make over themselves and all the lands in Egypt to the crown, in consideration of their receiving corn from the store-houses during the scarcity. Thus the ground and soil in Egypt become henceforward the property of the king, and every year the people pay for it a fifth part of the produce. The priests alone are exempt from this vassalage.

Then the end of Jacob's life is narrated in another fragment, which bears deep traces of R's revising handiwork. On his death-bed Jacob is visited by Joseph, who is accompanied by his two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim. Jacob blesses the father and sons, putting Ephraim before Manasseh. He promises that Joseph shall return to Canaan and possess there a portion of land which himself had taken from the Amorite with his sword and bow. Joseph mourns for his dead father, and has him embalmed. He reassures his brothers, whose consciences again become active after their father's death. Joseph himself dies in Egypt, one hundred and ten years old. He stipulates with his brothers that they shall take back his bones to Canaan.[2]

§ 13. *J's Narrative*

In common with the Priestly Writing the Yahvist is characterised by an endeavour to set forth the history of Israel in its relations to the world and the nations in general. Accordingly he traces, in a few rapid strokes, Israel's origin and its relationship to the other peoples, up to the first beginnings of the formation of nations after the great flood, or after the dispersion of the nations from Babel.

[1] Gen. xlvii. 13-26.

[2] Gen. xlviii. 1, 2*a*, 8, 9*a*, 10*b*, 11 f., 15 f., 20, 21 f. (of these 8, 11, 21 are common to E and J), l. 1-3 (common to E and J), 15-26 (except parts of J in 18, 21 f., 24). *Cf.* moreover, Wellh. xxi. p. 449; Dillm. *in loc.*; Budde in *ZA W.*, 1883, p. 57 ff.; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 8, No. 5.

The presence of these alternatives in the narrative points to two main streams which have united to form J. Wellhausen and Budde call them J^1 and J^2. In the primitive history they flow alongside each other. From the history of Abraham's immigration into Canaan they run in the same bed.[1] J^1 is the main stem of the Yahvistic narrative. It is not acquainted with the Deluge,[2] but in place of it puts the origin of the races of mankind from Babel, which ensued on the dispersion of the peoples. To it Noah's sons are Shem, Japheth, and Canaan. Abraham is descended from Noah and Shem, being the seventh in the line from the former. He sets out towards Canaan from Haran. J^2 inserted the account of the Deluge. He does not state where the ark landed.[3] To him Noah's sons are Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Abraham sets out from Ur Kasdim and comes to Haran.

Mankind, then, according to J^2, consists of three great families of nations, the descendants of Noah's sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. In our present text of J we have no further information concerning Japheth's posterity. Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan[4] are derived from Ham. Cush's son is Nimrod, the first ruler on earth. He first founds a kingdom in Shinar, with the cities Babylon, Erech, Accad, and Calneh. Then he turns towards Assyria and builds Nineveh, Rehoboth-Ir, Calah, and Resen. A number of tribes are derived from Mizraim, amongst them the Philistines, and the Caphtorim in Crete. Zidon, Heth, and the Canaanite peoples are descended from Canaan.[5]

Amongst Shem's sons the most important for J (J^1 and J^2) is Eber. So much is this the case 'that he is regarded as equivalent

[1] There is one exception at Gen. xv. 7 ff. For my position with regard to the question see further particulars in *ThStW.* vii. (1886), p. 201 f.: *cf.* also especially Riehm in *StKr.*, 1885, Heft 4.

[2] At most it was but briefly mentioned. See *ThStW.* vii. p. 202; Hommel, *Gesch. Bab. und Ass.*, p. 159.

[3] There is no reason for thinking of a southern mountain as the landing-place (Budde, *Urgesch.*, p. 438).

[4] Gen. x. 8-19, with the exception of *v.* 9.

[5] Probably x. 16-18 also belong to J (but this is opposed by Wellhausen, *JDTh.* xxi. p. 404; Meyer, *ZAW.* i. p. 124 f.; Budde, *Urgesch.*, p. 222).

to Shem.'[1] Shem is the father of all the Hebrews. Peleg and Joktan are Eber's sons. From the latter, the South Semitic Arabic tribes spring; from Peleg, no doubt, the North Semites. Abraham and Nahor, the sons of Terah, with their brother Haran, who died early, are the last links in this now broken genealogical chain,[2] which Wellhausen thinks possibly once consisted of seven members. Sarah is Abraham's wife, Milcah is Nahor's; the former is barren.[3] In its original form this source states that Aram-Naharaim was their home. In the form which it took somewhat later after being edited and expanded—to which I believe Gen. xv. 17 ff. also belongs—Ur Kasdim[4] is substituted. This name is inserted in xi. 28 as the starting-point of the migration, either by the editor[5] just mentioned, or afterwards by R.

2. J has thus supplied the statements needful to allow of his proceeding with *Abraham's* history.

In his home at Aram-Naharaim Abraham receives Yahvé's command to leave home and fatherland for a country which He will show him. There Yahvé will make of him a great nation, will bless him and cause all the families of the earth to bless themselves in him. Abraham believingly obeys the divine command. Lot accompanies him.[6]

Abraham reaches Canaan[7] and makes his way to Shechem. Yahvé appears to him there and assures him that this is the destined land which he is to possess. Abraham moves about from place to place as a no nad chief, resting first in Shechem and Bethel, and building altars.

[1] Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 396.

[2] This also was probably found in J^1 and adopted by J^2.

[3] Gen. x. 21, 25-30; xi. 28-30. *Cf.* Böhmer, *Lib. Gen.* (1860), p. 21; *Das Buch der Thora*, p. 32; also Budde, p. 414 ff.; and my discussion of the passage in *ThStW.*, 1886, p. 193 f.

[4] As to this passage belonging to J, *cf.* Budde, pp. 418 f., 439 f. As to the position of Ur Kasdim according to J^2, see below, § 17.

[5] As Budde maintains, *Urgesch.*, p. 442.

[6] Gen. xii. 1-4*a*.

[7] This must be supplied from the context: R has omitted it on account of *v.* 5.

[8] Gen. xii. 6-8, with the possible exception of 6*b*, and also excepting isolated notices from E (see above). *V.* 9 also belongs to (E or) R (against Dillmann,[5] p. 219; Budde, p. 7, Note) on account of xiii. 1-4 ff., which Wellhausen, xxi. p. 414, uses in proof of this.

Abraham and Lot are very rich in cattle. Their herdsmen come into collision in the narrow land. Abraham wishes to avoid disputes, and proposes that they shall separate as brothers, generously leaving to Lot the choice of the better part. Lot chooses the fertile pastures of the Jordan, the Ghôr as far as the south end of the Dead Sea, a district into which there flow numerous streams from the mountains. Abraham, on the other hand, as a token of God's approbation of his conduct, receives a fresh revelation from Yahvé, promising him anew the possession of the land. He travels through the length and breadth thereof, and finally takes up his abode under the terebinths of Mamre, near Hebron. There he builds an altar.[1]

A famine drives Abraham into Egypt. He represents Sarah to be his sister. Pharaoh takes her from him, and is consequently smitten with grievous plagues. He sets Sarah free, and Abraham returns to the south of Canaan.[2]

Here the word of Yahvé comes to him, promising him rich blessing. Abraham objects that he has no children, and that his (chief) domestic servant will be his heir. Yahvé promises that he shall have a son to be his heir. Abraham believes Yahvé, and this is reckoned to him for righteousness.[3]

To this R has appended a narrative of J's which originally stood in a different context, and contains elements belonging to E. It tells of a solemn covenant made by Yahvé with Abraham. Yahvé, who brought Abraham from Ur Kasdim,[4] promises that he shall possess the land. Abraham cannot believe this, and asks for a sign. Yahvé bids him cut in pieces the sacrificial animals. When the sun has gone down He causes sleep to fall upon him,

[1] Gen. xiii. 2, 5, 7-11*a*, 12*b*-18, verses which are immediately connected with xii. 8; *cf.* Dillm.[4] p. 212 ([5], p. 223).

[2] Gen. xii. 10-xiii. 1 (except ולוט עמו; *cf.* against Wellh. xxi. pp. 413, 419 (E); Dillm.[5] p. 223; Budde, p. 6 f.

[3] Gen. xv. 1, 3 f., 6 (*vv.* 1 and 6 common with E). Our analysis here deviates from that of Wellh. xxi. p. 411 f.; Dillm.[4] p. 230 f. ([5], p. 242); Budde, p. 416 f. *Cf.* also Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 8, Nos. 4, 8.

[4] On this account the narrative is probably a fragment from J[2]. That *v.* 7 = J *cf.* Budde, p. 439.

and announces to him that his descendants shall dwell in Egypt four hundred years, and then shall return and possess the land. A flame of fire, instead of Yahvé Himself, passes between the pieces of the offering; thus has Yahvé made a covenant with Abraham.[1]

For a time Sarah continues barren. Consequently she gives to Abraham her handmaid Hagar, who conceives, and therefore despises her barren mistress. Sarah asserts her rights as mistress, whereupon Hagar runs away. The angel of Yahvé finds her by a fountain in the wilderness, and assures her that Yahvé has noted her affliction, and that Ishmael, her son, shall be[2] a free, indomitable son of the desert.[3]

One day three men appear at Abraham's tent under the terebinths of Mamre. Abraham invites them to accept his hospitality. They inquire after Sarah, and one of the three, who is eventually recognised as Yahvé, promises her a son next year. Sarah, who is already aged, laughs incredulously. The men set out towards Sodom. On the way Yahvé makes known to Abraham, who is accompanying Him, His intention to punish the ungodly inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah. But Abraham's intercession obtains the assurance that Yahvé will spare the city if He find ten righteous men in it. Abraham returns home. Yahvé joins the two angels in Sodom.[4]

The angels who have preceded Him to Sodom are hospitably

[1] Gen. xv. 7-18 (except part of E in *vv.* 9, 12 [14 P?] and possibly *v.* 18). Most expositors (Dillm. *Gen.*[4] p. 231; Wellh. xxi. p. 411 f.) deny that the rest of the narrative (except *vv.* 19-21) comes entirely from J, simply because they look for an immediate connection with what has preceded. Possibly the word ירש was the occasion of the insertion of the fragment in this place. For further details see *ThStW.*, 1886, p. 195 ff., and, in opposition to Dillm. *Gen.*[5], *ibid.* p. 220.

[2] Gen. xvi. 1*b*-14. *Vv.* 8-10 may possibly be an addition, as Böhmer, *Das erste Buch der Thora*, p. 203, and Wellh. xxi. p. 410, think.

[3] It depends on *vv.* 8-10 whether J thought of Ishmael as born and bred in the desert, or related that Hagar returned to Abraham.

[4] Gen. xviii. The omission of the concluding statement is the only important flaw in the beautiful narrative. As to the unity of the chapter *cf.* (against Wellh.) Dillm.[5] p. 260.

received by Lot, but threatened with the foulest indignity by the Sodomites. They make Lot leave the city along with his family, because Yahvé will destroy it. Yahvé rains fire and brimstone on Sodom and Gomorrah. Lot escapes with his two daughters to Zoar. His wife looks round whilst they are on the way, and is turned into a pillar of salt. Abraham sees from afar the smoke of the burnt cities.[1]

Wellhausen has laid down a rule, the intrinsic correctness of which is indisputable, to the effect that ethical objections are not critical ones.[2] But admitting this, it remains doubtful whether the story of the origin of Moab and Ammon,[3] which now follows, belonged to the source before us. For it does not correspond with the picture of Lot which J elsewhere draws. It will therefore be advisable to follow Dillmann in ascribing it to the popular wit of the Hebrews, which in this way expressed its animosity against Moab-Ammon.[4]

To Sarah's astonishment the promise made to her is fulfilled; she fears that those who hear the news will laugh at her.[5] Our source also appears to confirm the statement that Abraham dwelt in Beersheba during Isaac's childhood.[6] And this is supported by the fact that J still contains elements of a narrative concerning the journey from Beersheba to sacrifice Isaac,[7] unless, indeed, as Dillmann thinks, these belong to R himself.[8]

As an introduction to the marriage negotiations on Isaac's behalf, J next inserts a section peculiar to himself respecting the family of Nahor, Abraham's brother.[9] Next we have a short digression on a second marriage of Abraham after Sarah's death and the contemporaneous independent settlement of Isaac near

[1] Gen. xix. 1-28. [2] *JDTh.* xxi. p. 417. [3] Gen. xix. 30-38.
[4] *Gen.*[5] p. 272. [5] Gen. xxi. 1*a*, 7, 6*b* (*cf.* Budde, pp. 224, 215).
[6] Gen. xxi. 33; *cf.* Dillm.[5] p. 284.
[7] In Gen. xxii. 2, 11, 14, and probably also *v.* 13. Against Dillm.[5] p. 285, who refers to xxi. 19, *cf.* xviii. 2; xxiv. 63; xxxiii. 1; xxxvii. 25 (xxxi. 10, 12).
[8] *Gen.*[4] p. 274 ([5], p. 286).
[9] Gen. xxii. 20-24. As to its belonging to J, *cf.* against Nöldeke (A) and Wellh. xxi. pp. 417, 419 (E), Dillm.[5] p. 289 f., and Budde, p. 423 f.

the well Lahai-roi.[1] Then comes the actual marriage negotiation and the marriage of Isaac with Rebekah.[2] In a lovely idyllic narrative, which reminds us in many respects of the author of chap. xviii. f., we are told how Abraham in his old age took steps to prevent his son from forming an alliance with the Canaanites that dwelt in the land, and to procure him a wife from his own home, Aram-Naharaim. He sends his house-steward thither to the city of Nahor. Under the evident guidance of Yahvé the steward succeeds in reaching his goal and finding the maiden destined for Isaac. It is Rebekah, the daughter of Bethuel, Abraham's nephew. The servant conducts her to Canaan, and Isaac brings her into his mother's tent and takes comfort in her after his father's death.[3] A further statement concerning Abraham's death in the interval seems to have dropped out. Rebekah thus becomes the second ancestress of the people of Israel.

3. Our source tells us more than E about *Isaac's* subsequent life, but the information it gives is comparatively small.

A famine tempts him to do as his father had done, and go into Egypt. Yahvé forbids him to do this. He remains near Lahai-roi in the district of Gerar, and Yahvé blesses him with abundant riches. On this account Abimelech, king of Gerar, thinks him too powerful, and sends him away. Isaac turns south-eastward to the Nachal Gerar. His servants dig wells here, but this brings them into conflict with the herdmen of Gerar. Hence the stations in the wilderness are called Esek, Siṭnah (Shuṭein), Rehoboth (Ruḥaibe).[4]

Rebekah, like Sarah, is barren. Isaac prays for her, and she conceives. Two children struggle in her womb. She inquires of Yahvé and learns that two peoples shall be separated from her

[1] Gen. xxv. 1-6, 11*b*. As to the position of this section *cf.* Wellh. xxi. p. 417 f.; Dillm.[5] p. 295; as to its belonging to J, Budde, p. 225.

[2] Gen. xxiv.

[3] *V.* 67, according to the reading אִבִּיו, proposed by Wellh. xxi. p. 418.

[4] Gen. xxvi. J's narrative is represented by the famine in *v.* 1, then *vv.* 2, 12-17 (except 15), 19-22. On account of xii. 10 ff. the rest cannot have come from J (against Wellh. xxi. p. 419; Dillm.[5] p. 317; Budde, p. 7, Note): *cf.* further Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 11.

bowels, the elder of whom must serve the younger. She bears twins, Esau, his father's favourite, who becomes a wandering hunter, and Jacob, beloved by his mother, because he is a quiet man and dwells in the tents. One day Jacob prepared lentile-pottage for himself. Esau comes in from the fields and wants some of it to eat. Jacob, with cunning selfishness, takes advantage of his brother's hunger and names the birthright as the price. Esau, carelessly despising his privilege, gives it up, and is now called the Red (Edom).[1]

The difference between the two brothers, which thus finds expression, is exacerbated and brought to a point by Jacob's fraudulent appropriation of the firstborn's blessing. The story of this in chap. xxvii. contains many touches derived from E, but it is still possible to distinguish a number of portions of the original narrative of our source.[2] The course of events is almost precisely the same as we have found in E. The only point peculiar to J is Esau's reference to his brother's name;[3] Jacob, he says, once before took hold of his heel when he bought the birthright; he has now done it a second time. J therefore does not trace the name Jacob back to the birth of the brothers.

4. From Beersheba, which in any case is not far from Nachal Gerar, the last of Isaac's dwelling-places mentioned in our source, Jacob sets out for Haran. One night[4] he dreams that Yahvé stands beside him, reveals Himself as the God of Abraham and Isaac, and promises that he shall return home prosperously and possess the land, and his seed shall spread abroad to the four winds of heaven. When he awakes he perceives that Yahvé is in this place, and calls it Bethel.[5]

R has omitted a statement in J, concerning the continuation of

[1] Gen. xxv. 21-24, 27-34 (*vv.* 24, 27 f. also in E). As to its being placed *after* chap. xxvi. see Dillm.[5] p. 312; as to *v.* 27, Budde, p. 217.

[2] To J probably belonged *v.* 7, part of 15 (against Dillm.; *cf.* indeed Dillm.[5] p. 333 as to xxix. 6, 18, with the authorship he ascribes to xxvii. 15, at p. 322), 20, 24-27, 29*b*, 30*a*, 35-38, 45.

[3] *V.* 35.

[4] At least the substance of xxviii. 11*a* must have stood in J as well as E.

[5] Gen. xxviii. 10 (11*a*), 13-16, 19*a*.

the journey, analogous to chap. xxix. 1. We next find Jacob before a well in the open country, where he enters into conversation with the shepherds who are watering their sheep. He learns that he is talking with the servants of Laban, son of Nahor, and brother of his mother. Laban's own daughter Rachel soon comes. Jacob, as a relative, kisses her and weeps for joy. Laban himself greets his sister's son, takes him into his house, and after Jacob has served him for some time, offers to arrange with him about wages.[1]

The negotiations concerning Rachel, the substitution of Leah, and the final winning of Rachel by another seven years' service, are now told by R from E. Nothing seems to point to our author except Laban's excusing himself by alleging a custom of the country.[2]

Leah bears Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, but Rachel is barren. By her handmaid, Bilhah, Jacob begets Dan and Naphtali; by Leah's handmaid, Zilpah, Gad and Asher. For Reuben's love-apple Leah purchases from Rachel the privilege of cohabiting with Jacob. Leah bears Issachar and Zebulun; Rachel bears Joseph.[3]

Jacob now wishes to return home. Laban will not let him go, and is ready to enter into fresh negotiations. Jacob does not want any wage, but would like to have all the lambs of unusual colours which are dropped henceforward by Laban's ewes. Laban consents. But Jacob is clever enough so to use all kinds of shepherds' tricks as to render the arrangement an advantageous one to himself.[4]

Jacob's prosperity arouses the discontent of Laban and his sons. Yahvé therefore bids Jacob turn homewards. Laban pursues him, overtakes him on Mount Gilead, and takes him to task.[5] Our source must have contained some account of the negotiations between Jacob and Laban which ended in their

[1] Gen. xxix. 2-15*a*. On *v.* 4 f., as on xxviii. 10, *cf.* *ThStW.*, 1886, p. 195.
[2] *V.* 26, because of צעיר and בכור.
[3] Gen. xxix. 31-35; xxx. 3*b*-5, 7, 9-16, 20*b*, 24*b*.
[4] Gen. xxx. 25, 27, 29-43.
[5] Gen. xxxi. 1, 3, 25, 27.

reconciliation. R has suppressed it in favour of the more complete narrative of E. Laban piles up a heap which is to be a witness that neither of the two parties shall cross this boundary to injure the other (Galeed).[1]

Jacob sends messengers before him to Esau. They return with the news that Esau is coming with four hundred men to meet Jacob. Jacob takes this to mean hostility, and in order to save at least the half, divides his people and flocks into two companies. He implores the protection of Yahvé, and seeks at the same time to win Esau's favour by valuable presents.[2] By the ford of the Jabbok he awaits the night, and when it falls crosses the stream with his wives and children. Here a man wrestles with him. Overcome by Jacob, the stranger calls him Israel, Striver with God. But at the same time he puts Jacob's thigh out of joint.[3]

It is only through this conflict with God, first in prayer and then in act, that Jacob's former sin against Esau is expiated. The meeting with Esau has now no perils for him. Esau comes to him reconciled, and Jacob moves on in safety to Succoth. Passing thence he settles at Shechem, according to this source also.[4]

We are not told much about the subsequent abode of Jacob-Israel in Canaan until we come to the history of Joseph. The chief piece is chap. xxxiv., the story of Dinah, a combination of P and J. On this subject Wellhausen and Dillmann differ strongly, but it seems to me that the latter's analysis rests on a more correct observation of the facts. Shechem, the son of Hamor,

[1] *V.* 51 f., but omitting מצבה, which is a harmonistic gloss, since (against Wellh. xxi. p. 431 f.) the verb ירה agrees only with גל; *cf.* הקים, *v.* 45.

[2] This follows from xxxiii. 9 f.

[3] Gen. xxxii. 5-14*a*, 23, 25-33 (*v.* 30 f., possibly from R). To me the chief reason for recognising J in 25 ff. (with Wellh. against Dillm.), together with linguistic tokens, is the name Israel, which thenceforward is a sign of J. The name Jacob is only employed, for the sake of harmony, in the remainder of this very chapter and in chap. xxxiv. (doubtless through R's editing). As to Elohim *cf.* Dillm.[5] p. 360, line 20.

[4] Gen. xxxiii. 1-4*a*, 4*c*, 5*a*, 6-10, 12-17 (parts of *v.* 19 f. ?).

the prince of the land, dishonours Jacob's daughter Dinah. He loves her, and when Jacob's sons[1] call him to account is prepared to comply with any conditions if he may be allowed to marry her. They require the circumcision of the Shechemites. Simeon and Levi treacherously fall on the Shechemites whilst they are suffering from their wounds, murder every male in the city and take Dinah away. Jacob dreads the consequences of the deed and strongly rebukes his sons.[2]

Possibly in consequence of this deed Israel leaves Shechem and comes to the tower of the flocks near Bethlehem. The reviser, referring to chap. xxxv. 10, here for the first time leaves the name Israel unaltered in J. At this place Reuben lies with his father's concubine Bilhah.[3] Perhaps a few portions of chap. xxvi., the list of the clans of Esau and the Edomites, and especially the beginning, belong to our source.[4] But the analysis is exceedingly uncertain and disputed. I do not feel called on to add to the controversy.

5. When we come to *Joseph* and his fortunes, our source again gives a connected narrative, parallel to that in E. The differences from E correspond entirely with those characteristics of J with which we have already become acquainted. Dreams fall into the background, and where they constitute an essential feature of the tradition, the section in question is at all events much less circumstantially worked out than in E. Judah takes Reuben's place as chief amongst the brothers. J's description gives the following picture.

Joseph lives with his half-brothers as a helper. Jacob-Israel, who now lives at Hebron, loves him because he is the son of his old age, and gives him a sleeved-garment. This makes the brothers jealous of Joseph.[5] They move towards Shechem from the pastur-

[1] As to the name Jacob see the last note but one, and what immediately follows.

[2] Gen. xxxiv. 1*b*, 2*b*, 3, 5, 7, 11-13, 14, 19, 25 f., 30 f. But on the other side see Wellh. xxi. p. 435 ff.; Kuen. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, xiv. p. 256 ff.; *Ond.*[2] § 16, No. 12.

[3] Gen. xxxv. 21 f.

[4] So Dillm.[4] p. 362 (somewhat altered in [5], p. 376). Budde differently, p. 347 f. *Cf.* also Bruston in *Rev. Théol.* (Montaub.), 1882, pp. 18 ff., 134 ff.

[5] Gen. xxxvii. 2*b*, 3, 4*a*, 11*a*. On the grounds for the analysis, see above, § 12.

age they have been in, which the narrator thinks of as near their father. Israel sends Joseph to see how they do. A man informs him that they have departed to Dothan, and he finds them there. When they see him afar off they resolve to kill him. Judah[1] opposes this and succeeds in carrying out another scheme. When Joseph comes up he is stripped of his sleeved-garment and sold to a caravan of Ishmaelites which is passing at the time. They send the sleeved-garment to their father, who recognises it and mourns him as torn in pieces by a wild beast. The sons pay a hypocritical visit to their father to comfort him.[2]

The author utilises the interval, until we come to learn more about Joseph's experiences, by inserting chap. xxxviii., an account of the origin of certain clans belonging to Judah which were in existence at a later date. The clans Er and Onan disappeared early. Their places were taken by Perez and Zerah. This is traced back to events in the family of Judah. Judah marries a Canaanitish wife and begets of her Er, Onan, and Shelah. Er dies childless, and Onan, as brother-in-law to the widow Tamar, is bound to raise up children to his brother by her. Because he refuses he is carried off by an early death. Judah is so troubled by the fate of his two sons that he withholds the third from Tamar, who therefore manages by artifice to lie with her father-in-law. The twins Perez and Zerah are Judah's sons by Tamar.[3]

Joseph's history is now resumed. He is brought by the Ishmaelites to Egypt and sold as a slave to an Egyptian. He wins his master's confidence and is set by him over the whole house. But his master's wife cast her eyes on the young man and makes proposals to him from which he escapes by a speedy flight. His mistress, dreading discovery, calumniates him to her husband, who thereupon has him cast into prison. But Yahvé here also gives him favour with the governor of the prison (whom J does

[1] At *v.* 21, read Judah instead of Reuben.

[2] Gen. xxxvii. 12, 13*a*, 14-18, 21, 23*b*, 25*aβ*-27, 28*ba*, 32 f. (for the most part), 35 (except the close).

[3] As to the district where the narrative originated, *cf.* Dillm.[5] p. 392; Reuss, Gesch. d. *AT.*, p. 250; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 9.

not identify with Joseph's first master). Hence he too sets Joseph over his house.[1]

Only from a few scattered indications,[2] taken together with the entire later development of the story, do we gather that our source also told of Joseph's being set at liberty and exalted as in E, though much more briefly. Here also Joseph rises through interpreting Pharaoh's dreams as referring to a period of plenty and of want in Egypt, and is set by Pharaoh over Egypt, especially over the granaries of the country.

But it is in the description of Joseph's contact with his brethren, occasioned by the famine in Canaan, especially after their second journey, chap. xlii. ff., that J comes in again more copiously and more consecutively. Jacob sends his sons to Egypt. Benjamin alone, of whom we now hear for the first time, is to stay with his father. Joseph, the ruler of Egypt, recognises them but conceals his own identity. He inquires after their father and brother,[3] and demands to see Benjamin in proof of their truthfulness. Nothing is said about Simeon being kept as a security. They travel home and on the journey find the money of one of them replaced in his sack. The others discover theirs when they reach home.[4] The famine grows more serious and compels Jacob to send his sons again to Egypt. Judah reminds him that they must not go there without Benjamin. He pledges himself to his father for him. Arrived in Egypt, they are invited to Joseph's house and treated with distinction, Benjamin especially. It is only by a violent effort that Joseph refrains from making himself known.[5]

Yet he put them through one more trial. They are dismissed, and not only is their money put in their sacks along with the corn but in Benjamin's sack Joseph's silver cup is placed. Scarcely have they left the city when they are pursued and Joseph's cup

[1] Gen. xxxix. 1*abβ*, 2 f., 4 (except וישרת אתו), 5*b*-23.

[2] Gen. xl. 1 (except the first four words); 3*b*; fragments in 5 and 15 and xli. 7; *cf.* further xli. 31, 34*a*, 35*a*, 41, 43*b*, 44, 49, 55. Dillmann even seems inclined to ascribe xli. 17-24 to J.

[3] Gen. xliii. 7.

[4] Gen. xliii. 12.

[5] Gen. xlii. 2*a*, 4*b*, 6*ab*, 7*aβ*, 27 f., 38; xliii. 1-13, 15-23*ab*, 24-34.

found in Benjamin's sack. They return. Judah enters Joseph's house at the head of the brethren. He makes no attempt to justify them, but acknowledges—and this is the one object aimed at in the contrivance—God's requiting finger in their fate. He tells Joseph all his old father's grief about Joseph and Benjamin and begs to be kept in bondage instead of the latter.[1]

Joseph is now overpowered with emotion. Weeping aloud he makes himself known to his brethren. They are to acquaint his father with his glory and invite him to Goshen. Jacob's mind is at once made up;[2] bringing with him all his possessions, he sets out from Hebron, where we last left him, for Beersheba.[3] This is the starting-point of the journey. Judah is sent on in advance to give Joseph notice. The latter receives his father and brethren splendidly and sends Pharaoh word. Their request for leave to pasture their flocks in the land of Goshen is granted. For not only the shepherd's trade,[4] but also the unsettled life of nomads[5] is an abomination to the Egyptians.

It is probable from certain tokens[6] that chap. xlvii. 13-26, the account of the good done to Egypt by Joseph, also stood in J, though in a somewhat different position.

On his deathbed Jacob-Israel sends once more for Joseph and binds him by an oath not to leave his corpse in Egypt, but to bury him with his fathers in Canaan.[7] At the same time Jacob blesses the sons of Joseph, deliberately preferring the younger Ephraim to the older Manasseh.[8]

It is highly probable that chap. xlix. 1-28, with the so-called Blessing of Jacob, though not composed by J himself, was adopted by him and had a place in this source. The pre-eminence ascribed to Judah, as well as the rejection of Reuben and Simeon,[9] is in

[1] Gen. xliv.; but *cf.* above, p. 145. [2] Gen. xlv. 1*a*, 2, 4*c*, 5*aαγ*, 10, 13 f., 28.
[3] Gen. xlvi. 1*a*. It is not certain, but it is probable, that some contributions from J, *e.g.*, 12*b*, 19 f., are to be found in the list of the members of Jacob's family which follows. [4] *V.* 6*b*. [5] Gen. xlvi. 28-xlvii. 5*a*,6*b*.
[6] In *vv.* 13 and 25; possibly also in 17. [7] Gen. xlvii. 27*a β*, 29-31.
[8] Gen. xlviii. 2*b*, 8-11*a*, 13 f., 17-19, 21*a* (in *vv.* 8, 11*a*, and 21*a* there are also parts of E).
[9] *Cf.* chap. xxxiv. But see also Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 8, No. 6; § 13, No. 16.

entire agreement with J's whole habit of thought, whereas these traits are in marked opposition to E.

Joseph mourns for his dead father, and has him embalmed after the Egyptian fashion. He then requests permission from Pharaoh to fulfil his promise of burying Jacob in Canaan. Afterwards he returns with his brethren and continues to treat them magnanimously, till at last he dies at the age of one hundred and ten.[1]

§ 14. *The Priestly Writing and the Editing.*

The fact that these two constituents of the whole are more closely related to each other than to any of the rest justifies and demands our treating them together. Whether P represents the oldest or the youngest source of the Hexateuch, it is, at any rate, certain that none of the others so plainly exhibits that scheme of historical narration which R afterwards followed. To this extent this document must still be called the 'Fundamental Writing' of the Hexateuch, as regards its contents, just as it used to bear that name with reference to its antiquity. It gives us with the greatest clearness the outline of the whole. R has followed its line of thought as 'the thread on which the pearls of J and E are strung.'[2]

1. *The Priestly Writing.*—P, like the others, dovetails the history of Israel into the universal history of the nations after the Flood, as the latter runs its course in the three groups represented by Shem, Ham, and Japheth. It is true that the editor has given us no complete information concerning the list of nations belonging to this source,[3] except that about the family of Japheth, which is omitted in J. P ascribes to Ham the same sons as J,—Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan,—adding Put in the third place. But the Arabian tribes which J derives from Eber are here connected with Cush. The consciousness was lost that these tribes were originally brothers of the Hebrews. Shem's sons are Elam, Asshur, Arpachsad, Lud, and Aram.

[1] Gen. l. 1-3 (common with E), 4-11, 14; parts of 18, 21 f., 24.
[2] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 351 (Eng. Trans. p. 332). [3] Gen. x. 1-7, 20, 22 f., 31 f.

Aram and Arpachsad are the most important of these sons of Shem in P's eyes. The sons of the former are at least mentioned in the list of nations (Gen. x. 23), whilst the family of the latter is traced right down in the form of a genealogy of Abraham's direct ancestors, containing ten names.[1] This makes Abraham the tenth in descent from Shem, with Arpachsad, Shelah, Eber, and Peleg, as his progenitors.[2]

Terah is Abraham's father. His brothers are Nahor and Haran, the latter being Lot's father. Terah, with his son Abram, his nephew Lot, and Sarai, Abram's wife,[3] sets out from Ur Kasdim for Canaan. They reach Haran and tarry there. Terah dies there aged one hundred and forty-five[4] years; Haran dies too.[5] Abram, who is now seventy-five years old, resumes the march to Canaan in the year of his father's death. Lot accompanies him.[6] Later on we must discuss the situation of Ur Kasdim, as P conceived it.

Arrived in Canaan, Abram separates from Lot and settles in the south, near Mamre, not far from Hebron,[7] whilst Lot chooses the pasture lands of the Jordan,[8] eastward. Sarai is barren: she therefore gives her Egyptian handmaid Hagar to Abram, ten years after their immigration into Canaan. She bears Ishmael in Abram's eighty-sixth year.[9] Thirteen years later, in Abram's ninety-ninth year, God makes a covenant with him and gives him the name Abraham, which contains the pledge of a numerous posterity. The ordinance of the covenant is the command that every male in Abraham's house shall be circumcised. Sarai also is now to be called Sarah, Princess, for she is to be the mother of

[1] On the mode of reckoning see Budde, *Bibl. Urgesch*, p. 412 f.

[2] Gen. xi. 10-26.

[3] It is doubtful whether P thinks of Nahor also as journeying with them (see Budde, p. 424 ff.). Hence, as is natural, P knows no descendants of him in Haran.

[4] Thus, according to the Samaritan. Budde, p. 429 ff.

[5] Gen. xi. 27, 31 f. On *v.* 28 *cf.* my discussion in *ThStW.* vii. (1886), p. 193 f., and Dillm. *Gen.*[4] p. 199; Wellh. xxi. p. 398; Budde, p. 426. Against Dillm. in *Gen.*[5] see the Epilogue in *ThStW.* vii. p. 219 f.

[6] Gen. xii. 4*b*, 5.

[7] Gen. xxiii. 17, 19; on this Dillm.[5] p. 229.

[8] Gen. xiii. 6, 11*b*, 12*a*.

[9] Gen. xvi. 1*a* (Budde, p. 417 f.; *cf.* Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 6, No. 1), 3, 15 f.

nations and kings. Abraham laughs incredulously. His son, who is to come into the world in the following year, is therefore to be called Isaac.[1]

God delivers Abraham and Lot from the destruction of the cities of the Kikkar. At the appointed time, in Abraham's hundredth year, the promised son is born: he is named Isaac, and circumcised.[2] Sarah dies at Hebron, one hundred and twenty-seven years old. Abraham buys from the Hittites the Cave of Macpelah for a family sepulchre. He too is gathered to his fathers at the age of one hundred and seventy-five. Isaac and Ishmael bury him in the same cave.[3]

The method of this author can be seen at once from the history of Abraham. He simply sketches the course of the history and does not narrate it. With a few exceptions, things in which the author took special interest, the account is given in a quite summary fashion. The principal data are put together briefly and drily. The skeleton is entirely without flesh and blood. Number and measurement play a leading part. The same characteristic prevails throughout the patriarchal history and beyond.[4]

The Toledoth of Ishmael are then briefly given. He lives to be one hundred and thirty-seven years old, and from him descend the clans of the Arabs of the desert, such as Nebaioth, Kedar, and Tema.[5] The Toledoth of Isaac immediately follow. When forty years of age he takes to wife Rebekah, the daughter of Bethuel the Aramæan in Paddan-Aram. Her descent from Nahor and relationship to Abraham is not implied, or at all events not mentioned in P. It would seem, indeed, as if the contrary were suggested by the designation, 'the Aramæan.'[6] Isaac is sixty years old when his two sons are born. Forty years afterwards Esau grieves his parents by marrying two Hittite women. *This*, not a quarrel with Esau, is the reason why Rebekah and Isaac send Jacob to Paddan-Aram to his uncle Laban, that he may take

[1] Gen. xvii.
[2] Gen. xix. 29; xxi. 1*b*, 2-5.
[3] Gen. xxiii., xxv. 7-11*a*.
[4] *Cf.* above, at the beginning of § 9.
[5] Gen. xxv. 12-17.
[6] *Cf.* Budde, p. 421 f.

a wife from thence. Isaac blesses him, and that of his own accord.[1]

The narrative of P as we now possess it tells us nothing more about Jacob's sojourn in Paddan-Aram.[2] It narrates only his return (xxxi. 18). But although P did not give a detailed account of Jacob's experiences there, it must have contained a statement concerning the patriarch's double marriage there. This appears from its enumeration of Jacob's sons,[3] which agrees with the accounts of the other narrators except that it places Benjamin's birth in Mesopotamia. The stay there lasts eighty years according to P.

On his return Jacob settles in the neighbourhood of Shechem.[4] The events connected with Dinah happened there, and are related otherwise than in J. Shechem, son of the prince Hamor, desires Dinah for his wife. His father demands her in marriage for him, and at the same time solicits liberty of intermarriage between Jacob's family and the inhabitants of the land. The sons of Jacob insist on circumcision. The Shechemites in solemn assembly consent to this, hoping for the profit that may be expected to follow their connection with Israel. The transaction appears to have proceeded peaceably, *vv.* 27-29 being possibly an addition due to R.[5]

God had already appeared to Jacob, immediately after his return from Paddan-Aram, and had conferred on him the name Israel; the land belongs to him and kings shall come out of him. Jacob calls the place of this appearance Bethel, and hallows it by setting up a maṣṣeba.[6] Thence he returns to Isaac at Hebron, and thereupon his father dies, one hundred and eighty years old. Next comes a short section entitled the Toledoth of Esau. Esau leaves Jacob, taking his possessions with him to another land, for

[1] Gen. xxvii. 46-xxviii. 9.

[2] Probably also not in xxix. 24, 29 (Wellh.).

[3] Gen. xxxv. 22*b*-26.

[4] Gen. xxxiii. 18.

[5] Gen. xxxiv. 1*a*, 2*a*, 4, 6, 8-10 (14), 15-17, 20-24 (with Dillmann, against Wellhausen and Kuenen).

[6] Gen. xxxv. 9-15, to which 22*b*-29 directly attach themselves (against Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 349, Eng. Trans. p. 330).

their belongings were more than the land could bear. Here also nothing is said about hostility between the brothers. Rather is the relation between Abraham and Lot taken as the model.[1]

The entire remainder of the patriarchal history is given under the title, Toledoth of Jacob. Jacob dwells in the land of Canaan.[2] The emigration to Egypt is mentioned immediately after. No other particular of Joseph's history seems to be told us now from P.[3] Yet it must have contained at least the skeleton of the history of Joseph, for when P strikes in again it is assumed that Joseph first dwelt in Egypt, and Jacob and the brothers came subsequently at his instigation.[4] When Pharaoh hears of their arrival in Egypt he gives Joseph to understand that the whole land is before them, and they may dwell in the best part of Egypt. Jacob, who is a hundred and thirty years old, blesses Pharaoh. Joseph, at Pharaoh's bidding, gives his family the best part of the land, the land of Rameses. They settle here and increase in numbers. Jacob lives in Egypt seventeen years.[5] Before his death he adopts Joseph's two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh; they shall be to him as Reuben and Simeon. He also blesses his sons (except Joseph), each with a special blessing, and commands them to bury him in the Cave of Macpelah which Abraham purchased, and where he rests with Sarah, Isaac, Rebekah, and Leah. His sons do as he has commanded. The children of Israel multiplied till the land was full of them.[6]

2. *The Editor.*—For the part which the editors took in putting together the Hexateuch as it now stands, Genesis included, the discussions which we have already given may be consulted.[7] It was

[1] Chap. xxxvi. *Vv.* 6-8, 40-43 (Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 6, No. 1) certainly belong to P, and probably, omitting additions by R, 15-39.

[2] Gen. xxxvii. 1, 2*aα*.

[3] At the utmost only xli. 45 f., 50, could be thought of, but even this is uncertain.

[4] Gen. xlvi. 6 f., 8-27 (the latter section revised by R in 8*b*, 12*b*, 19 f.).

[5] Gen. xlvii. 5, 6*a* (LXX.; *cf.* Wellh. xxi. p. 441 f.; Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 434; Kuenen, *ut supra*), 7-11, 27 (except 'Israel' and 'in the land of Goshen), 28.

[6] Gen. xlviii. 3-7; xlix. 28*b*-33; l. 12 f.; Exod. i. 1-5, 7.

[7] See above, § 8, p. 74 f., and § 10, p. 131 f.

there shown that prior to the final amalgamation of the sources by R^h there was a preliminary one by R^d. But R^h remained the principal work. To it the book owes its present shape.

Let any one take the trouble to note in our present text of the Patriarchal History the three sources E, J, and P, of which we have given a consecutive view in the preceding pages. He will easily perceive that (especially when the matter due to R^d is eliminated) nothing but the minutest fragment of the text remains for R^h. But it would be an utter mistake to infer that this editor did little. It only follows that his work was considerate and delicate.

As a matter of fact it was R's task so to treat all the material he found in the three main sources as to blend it into a readable whole. And it was especially important to smooth over, as far as possible, the manifold discrepancies and differences. Nor was it enough for the book to present a mere outward appearance of unity. The ethical and religious, the theocratic and national points of view which are so evident in the several narrative-books, above all in J, the distinctly prophetic narrator, must give the key-note by which the whole book is ruled.

This object could be attained by a few quite unostentatious means. Since P furnishes a fixed chronological system, the lines laid down in it are used as the foundation for the external structure of the whole book. In like manner J's prophetic ideas are made the standard in accordance with which the sequence of events is arranged. Plan and Form, the Course of Events, and the Course of Ideas, are thus firmly outlined. To carry all this out requires next an arranging and sifting of the material found in the sources which is in many respects hard to manage. R's chief method is that of mosaic inlaying. The several sources are first disintegrated into short narratives and parts of narratives. Then they are carefully put together in such a way that the portions from each of the sources dealing with each subject are united. Sometimes the sources, or two of them (especially E and J), resemble each other very closely. At others their contents or

their ideas are too markedly inharmonious. In these cases we find one source drawn upon for the main body of the narrative and smaller additions taken from the other by way of embellishment and completion. It is only when this latter means proves insufficient and R deems the contradiction too great that he has recourse to the other means of an independent contribution from his own pen.

These contributions are mainly in the form of short glosses, explanations, transitions, and connecting links, seldom in that of longer independent additions. Somewhat more frequently there are omissions, such as we have met with especially in the treatment of P's history of Jacob and Joseph, or in the part of E which precedes Gen. xx. We may mention, by way of example, that whilst P alone relates the change of Abram's and Sarai's names into Abraham and Sarah, it is at Gen. xvii. that all the sources, as we now have them, begin to write the names in the latter form.[1]

If this is the way and manner in which R blends his sources, it follows that it is to him we owe the picture of the patriarchal history which we draw from the present text of Genesis. By the very nature of the case it is a more complete picture, richer in concrete traits, and especially in the predominance given to the ethical and religious contents of the narrative, than would be derivable from any single one amongst our documentary sources. But, on the other hand, it is just as clear that in historical fidelity it may possibly not be equal to that given in the original sources.[2]

Probably Böhmer[3] has treated of R with the greatest thoroughness. But he ascribes too many portions of the text to R himself, and consequently arrives at too unfavourable a verdict on him.[4]

[1] As to the details of P's action, *cf.* the valuable summary in Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. xv. f., with which in many respects we can agree.

[2] So too Aug. Köhler, *PRE.*[2] i. p. 97, although he does not deduce the necessary consequences.

[3] *Das erste Buch der Thora*, pp. 123-302. [4] *Cf.* especially p. 300 ff.

II. THE HISTORICAL SUBSTANCE OF THE STORY OF THE PATRIARCHS.

§ 15. *The Patriarchs in General.*

Glance now over the collective contents of the documentary sources of Israel's earliest history which are stratified in the manner we have described. According to what has already been said of the relative and absolute age of these sources, it is plain that none of them can be used immediately as a document stating nothing but historical facts. All three main sources, as well as the editor's work of connecting them together, are too far removed from the events they narrate to make any well-grounded claim to this. Consequently we are unable, without essential modifications, to recognise the validity of the attempt to take as the foundation one of these sources, say the oldest of them, E (or, as others think, P or J), as exclusively representing the historical facts. Nor is it any more justifiable to use our present text,[1] which was the work of the editor, as an immediate source or as an authentic addition to the original documents.

But, on the other hand, there is an important fact confronting this preliminary negative result. A complete laying bare of the strata that make up the mass of tradition forces us to see that although there are many differences in detail, there is throughout a remarkable agreement as to the general course of events. Under the circumstances, it must be admitted that the fact of a statement being made in all the sources accessible to us does not conclusively demonstrate its historical trustworthiness. But it does prove the existence of a solid core of harmonious traditional matter. The value of this core is by no means small, for it supplies the primary condition of a real history. If the traditions were confusedly intermixed, this would stamp them as arbitrary manufactures, or products of popular fancy. Their not being so, though far from proving their reliableness as history, justifies

[1] As Köhler wishes to do, although he acknowledges the justification of documentary analysis; *cf. PRE.*[2] i. p. 97.

the presumption that we may perhaps succeed in finding a historic core in the history of the patriarchs. For actually reaching that core, as nearly as the means now at our command allow, there is but one means. We must endeavour to find confirmation of prominent facts belonging to the patriarchal history in witnesses brought from the Bible or elsewhere which can lay claim to historic credibility.

It has indeed been thought right by some authors to entirely deny beforehand the historical validity of the patriarchal story. The absolutely unhistorical character of the narrative is maintained on such grounds as the following:—It wears the garb of a mere family history; the patriarchs are at one and the same time individuals and the ancestors of the tribes of Israel; their history is in many respects interwoven with reminiscences of a later period and filled with views, sympathies, and antipathies which belong to the times of the author.[1]

Now it cannot be denied that no nation known to us in history can be traced back to a single progenitor. The spaces of time that intervene between the progenitor or progenitors and the nation are always too vast, and the complications and tribal mixtures too varied and numerous to allow of the development being traced back to those ancestors.[2] It must likewise be admitted that the life and thought of a later time are in many respects interwoven in the story of Genesis. The characters of Esau and Ishmael obviously present the traits of the peoples derived from them. Ishmael, the wild son of the desert, is evidently the type of the Bedouin of the Arabian desert. The rough hunter, Esau, whom Jacob cozens and deprives of his birthright, is the model of the Edomites, who reached an independent national existence before Israel, but were soon surpassed and subdued by the latter.[3]

[1] Dozy, *Die Israeliten zu Mekka*, 1864; Bernstein, *Der Ursprung der Sagen über Abraham, Isaak und Jakob*, 1871; Kuenen in *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1871, p. 255 ff.; Goldziher, *Mythology among the Hebrews*, 1877; Popper, *Ursprung des Monotheism*, 1879. Among others *cf.* also Stade, *Gesch. Isr.*, i. p. 127 f.; Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 336.

[2] Bernstein, *ut supra*, pp. 10 f., 38; Stade, *ZA W.* i. p. 347 ff.

[3] Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 340 (Eng. Trans. p. 322).

But what does all this prove except that our sources are not historical documents in the strictest sense of the word? If we wished to ascribe a historical character to the very words of Genesis or of one of its sources, we should at all events be going in opposition to the mode in which Genesis itself tells its story, as well as to the facts which we know concerning the origin of the nations. But none of the reasons alleged against the historical value of the core of the primitive history forbids our regarding the patriarchs as tribal chiefs, each of whom stood at the head of a nomad tribe already existent and subject to himself, to which, as its leader, he gave the name it subsequently bore. The family histories of Genesis are thus simply the form in which the events of a far distant past were preserved in the popular tradition of later generations. But in that tradition there survives matter which, though not historical in its every feature, must be held genuinely such in a number of essential leading points.

Ewald[1] attributed great importance to the consideration that the tradition consistently describes the patriarchs as nomadic herdsmen, unacquainted with the blessings of an orderly, settled mode of life, whereas the Canaanites round about them had reached this long before. In this consciousness of having started from the life of wandering nomads, which the later Hebrews preserved, Ewald finds a reminiscence of the state of affairs preceding the stay in Egypt. Now it must be conceded that the force of this argument is somewhat diminished by the possibility of this later surviving consciousness having really originated in the nomadic life which the Hebrews lived after their stay in Egypt, and then being transferred to the period prior to that stay. But there is another consideration, also urged by Ewald, the force of which it is impossible to evade. He reminds us[2] that whilst all the accounts agree in representing it as the divine purpose that Abraham and the other patriarchs shall provisionally take possession of the land of Canaan, they are never represented as actually

[1] *Gesch. Isr.*[3] i. p. 433 (Eng. Trans. i. p. 302).
[2] *Isr.*[3] p. 437 f. (Eng. Trans. i. p. 305 f.).

possessing the whole. They confine themselves to small portions, and these, for the most part, of minor importance. Abraham settles in the south, pasturing alternately in the districts of Mamre-Hebron and Beersheba-Gerar. Isaac is found chiefly in the latter district, and Jacob in the country about Shechem. If the patriarchs had never actually lived in Canaan;[1] if their abode there and their very personality had belonged merely to the realm of legend, it might have been confidently expected that the later legend would have been able to provide a more lasting and strong foundation for the claim to the whole land advanced by the Hebrews than this mere partial possession by their fathers. Nor is there any such great difficulty as Stade[2] imagines in believing that the Canaanites afterwards adopted sanctuaries founded by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. If the Israelites subsequently did this with the Canaanite sanctuaries, and no one counts this impossible,[3] why should a like procedure on the part of the Canaanites be a thing so totally unheard of?

Another hypothesis has been proposed, according to which the ancestors of the people of Israel, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are in the last resort nothing but original tribal deities.[4] Almost without exception its advocates have brought this forward as a mere conjecture without attempting to adduce any solid proof. As a matter of fact, there are no clear traces of this in our tradition.[5] And it would seem self-contradictory[6] to accept this theory and then admit that the genealogy of Abraham could

[1] Nöldeke, *Unters.*, p. 156 ff.; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 110.

[2] *Gesch.* i. p. 127. [3] *Cf.* Stade, *Gesch.* i. p. 128.

[4] Nöldeke, *Untersuch.*, p. 157; Dozy, *ut supra*, p. 21 ff. (likewise Goldziher and Popper); for Abraham, Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. p. 374, and especially *ZA W.* vi. 16, viii. 43.—Abraham = Dusares—also Lagarde, *Armen. Studien*, 1877, p. 162, and *Übersicht*, p. 93. Against the equation Abraham = Dusares, *cf.* also what Wellhausen adduces respecting Sharé, *Reste arab. Heident.*, p. 45 ff. *Cf.* also Sayce, Hibbert Lect., 1887, pp. 285, 163 f., 181; W. R. Smith, *Relig. of Sem.*[2] p. 467; and Hewitt in *Journ. of Roy. As. Soc.*, 1890, p. 754 ff.

[5] Jacob, on the contrary, is probably an ancient tribal name. It is only in the case of Esau that we might with some reason remember the later name Obed-Edom. On the other hand, the equation Abraham = Dusares (besides Lagarde and Mordtmann, see also now Ed. Meyer in *ZA W.* vi. 16) has too few tangible points of support to be held correct. [6] *Cf.* Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 215 f.

also originate, for in it the tribal ancestors of Israel, whether they be persons or peoples, evidently find their place as progenitors of the people.

§ 16. *Abraham.*[1]

If we now proceed from this starting-point to test particulars, it will appear that in many respects we have historic ground beneath our feet—especially at the beginning and the end of the patriarchal history, the accounts of Abraham and Joseph. Later times have preserved the truest recollection of the two most important landmarks in the earliest history, the immigration into Canaan and the settlement in Egypt.

It is a fixed point in Israelite tradition that the Hebrew nationality did not originate in Canaan, but on the other side the Euphrates. Abraham separated himself from his father's household, which had its home there, and set out westwards with a portion of the paternal tribe. He settled in Canaan as a nomad chief, and under special divine guidance came to look on this land as belonging to himself and his tribe.

There needs no proof that, as this tradition indicates, the origin of the Hebrews points to the land of the two rivers. The fixed tradition of the Hebrews in E, J, P (Deut. xxvi. 5, Isa. xli. 9), the natural relationship between the Israelite and the Aramæan races, as well as the similarity in their speech, declare unmistakably in favour of this view. Hence the fact is unanimously admitted by all investigators, and the only outstanding question which will be dealt with below is, whether Haran is to be taken as the actual fatherland or as a merely temporary abode of the Hebrews.

But Israelite tradition does more than mention the immigration of the tribe from the East; it connects this in the most definite manner with the person of Abraham. What of the historical value of the picture which tradition gives of him?

[1] On this subject *cf.* also Schrader in *Sitz.-Ber. d. Berl. Akad. d. Wissensch.*, 1887, p. 600 ff.; Wellh. *Comp. d. Hex.*[2] 1889, p. 310 f.; Halévy, *Rev. des études juives*, pp. 1 ff., 178 ff., 199.

It might seem as though the first thing to be done was to appeal to the mention of Abraham in the prophetical writings[1] of the Old Testament in proof of his historic reality. But the appeal would not give promise of any large result. The older of these passages are called in question.[2] And all of them together bring us down to the period which is later than the oldest information respecting Abraham in Genesis. Consequently they only avail to show that in the time of those prophetic writings, especially in the Exile, the figure of Abraham formed a fixed part of the popular consciousness, and was readily referred to by the prophets. The fact of Amos[3] or his immediate successors[4] not mentioning Abraham, as they do Isaac and Jacob, cannot lead to the conclusion that Abraham is the youngest patriarchal figure.[5] In E and J, one at least of which precedes the earlier prophets, the figure of Abraham stands firmly beside Isaac and Jacob. And the special recollection of him during the Exile is easily explicable on other grounds.[6]

It is impossible not to recognise a certain amount of arbitrariness in the assertion that the name Abram is not historical but symbolical,[7] invented therefore in the service of an idea, simply because it has a meaning ('exalted father'). If Abram, as seems quite plausible, is identical with Abîrām, the historical employment of the name, not only in Israel but also in Assyria,[8] can be directly shown. So much on the assumption that Abram is the original form. But if Abraham is the older, as Stade is inclined to think,[9] we get at once the desired inexplicableness.

Finally, unless we are willing to give up the mission of Moses and the prophetic idea of him—a course which even Wellhausen[10]

[1] Micah vii. 20; Isa. xxix. 22 f.; xli. 8 f.; lii. 2; lxiii. 16; Jer. xxxiii. 26; Ezek. xxxiii. 24; (Ps. cv. 6).

[2] On Micah vii. 20, and Isa. xxix. 23, see Wellhausen, *Proleg.*[2] p. 338 (Eng. Trans. p. 320).

[3] Amos vii. 9, 16 (Isaac).

[4] Hosea xii. 3 f.; Isa. ii. 3; ix. 8; x. 20; Micah i. 5.

[5] So Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 338 (Eng. Trans. p. 320).

[6] *Cf.* Rösch in *StKr.*, 1885, p. 349.

[7] Nöldeke, *ut supra*, p. 157; Dozy, *ut supra*, p. 21 ff.

[8] Schrader, *KAT.*[2] p. 200 (Eng. Trans. i. p. 190).

[9] *ZAW.* i. p. 348 f.

[10] *Abriss der Gesch. Isr. und Judas*, p. 1 ff. (English Edition, p. 1 ff.).

and Smend[1] do not declare for—the patriarchal period, especially that of Abraham, must be regarded as the necessary presupposition for the Mosaic period. The religious position of Moses stands before us unsupported and incomprehensible unless we believe the tradition according to which he appealed to the God of their fathers. Moses would scarcely have made his way amongst his people if he had come in the name of a strange and hitherto unheard-of God. But he might reasonably hope for success if a fresh revelation had been made to him by the God of Abraham, who was still worshipped in some circles and still lived in the memory of the people. And what was there to induce the Israelite mythology to refrain from concentrating all the glory of founding the national Church and State on Moses, the greatest man in the nation's history? Why should it not have made the history of the people open with the splendid triumph over the Egyptian bondage, the revelation of Yahvé to Moses on Sinai, the glorious conquest of Canaan? To obtain a land assigned and presented to the people by Yahvé in the time of Moses was not by a single hair's-breadth less legitimate than to inherit one made over and promised to their fathers. In either case it belonged to the people without any external title through a divine and therefore righteous appointment. If, in spite of all this, Israelite tradition, both in history and prophecy, goes further back than Moses and finds in the patriarchs the first roots not only of the possession of the land, but also of the people's higher worship of God, this can only be accounted for by assuming that memory had retained a hold of the actual course of events.

It may, therefore, be assumed that the person of Abraham rests on a historical background. In particular, it seems pretty certain that what we are told concerning his higher knowledge of God cannot be regarded as mere fiction. It is noteworthy that the very oldest source ascribes his separation from his fellow-tribesmen to the religious position which he took up,[2] and that in general his

[1] *ZA W.* ii. p. 199.

[2] Josh. xxiv. 2 f. (E). *Cf.* H. Schultz, *A TL. Theol.*[2] pp. 103 f., 112 (Eng. Trans. i. pp. 94, 97, 108).

significance from the religious point of view is repeatedly brought forward.[1]

This idea of Abraham finds a strong confirmation in Gen. xiv., a portion of our sources which is distinguished in a remarkable way above all the rest of our information concerning Abraham by its contact with non-Israelite accounts of ancient date.[2]

But manifold objections have been raised against this narrative. Its literary peculiarities, both in speech and matter, are obvious and universally recognised; hence it has been maintained that it did not find its place in the present union of the sources till very late, and indeed was not composed till late.[3] But its contents especially aroused suspicion. Its object was believed to be transparent, the glorification, that is, as a heroic warrior, of the Abraham who till now has seemed to be but a 'Muslim and a prophet.' The names of the rebellious Canaanite kings were explained as symbols of rebellion; the invading chiefs from the east were supposed to have been partly pure inventions and partly names put together out of remnants of tradition, the meaning of which had grown uncertain through the lapse of time. The plan of campaign adopted by the foreign kings was declared to be absurd, the forces called out by Abraham inadequate to a 'fight of nations,' the allies of Abraham to be *heroes eponymi* of the Hebron district. Melchizedek, the priest-king of Salem, who met Abraham, shared the same fate. His name is asserted to be symbolic and therefore unhistorical, his city to be a later reflex of Jerusalem, his two-fold dignity invented in support of a 'tendency,' his adoration of God historically impossible.[4]

[1] *Cf.* Gen. xv. 6; chap. xxii.; Gen. xii. 2 f.; xviii. 18; xxii. 18; xxvi. 4.

[2] On the Assyriologists' side, *cf.* especially Schrader, *KAT.*[2] p. 135 ff. (Eng. Trans. i. 120 ff.); Fr. Delitzsch, *Par.*, p. 224; F. Hommel, *Allg. Zeitg.*, 1880, No. 112; his *Gesch. Assyr. und Babyl.*, 1885, pp. 9, 150, 158; Tiele, *Bab.-Assyr. Gesch.*, p. 123 f. Besides these, especially Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 432 (Eng. Trans. i. p. 301); Dillm. on Gen. xiv.; Rösch, *StKr.*, 1885, p. 321 ff.: in the last-named passage additional literature is given.

[3] Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, p. 165 f.; with some reserve Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 414 f.; Justi, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, p. 155.

[4] *Cf.* especially Nöldeke, *Unters. z. Kritik d. AT.*, p. 156 ff.; also Hitzig, *Gesch. Isr.*, pp. 25, 44 f., and Bohlen earlier.

But these reasons are not sufficient to prove the occurrence unhistoric.

Obviously and admittedly the literary character of Gen. xiv. forbids our placing it directly in any of the larger documents we possess, although in character and matter it stands nearest to E. A number of glosses and later notices prove it to have been revised by R, and it is to this revision that the reference to Jerusalem and the payment of tithes there are due. But this does not justify the theory that the passage was composed late. For on the other hand there are unmistakable tokens of great antiquity. It gives us names which are found nowhere else save on the Assyrian monuments, and there point to a great antiquity. It is acquainted with circumstances in Canaan which survive also in the ancient reminiscences both of natives[1] and of foreigners.[2] It is conversant with the most ancient designation of God, found on Phœnician and Assyrian monuments, and within the Old Testament in the portion dealing with Balaam, which also no doubt rests on ancient tradition. And if we cannot fit it directly into any of the extant sources a satisfactory explanation is forthcoming. The real explanation of its literary peculiarity is not that it was composed very late, but that it is of foreign origin. That R, rather than any other writer, should have worked up this foreign material, which bears on its face the stamp of its external origin, is quite natural. Ewald[3] correctly inferred its non-Israelite origin from its calling Abraham a Hebrew. Add to this the consideration that the narrative bears the stamp of antiquity, and there will be found good reason for the conjecture that it is an original ancient document of Canaanitish-Phœnician[4] origin, which probably came into being amidst a Canaanite priesthood before Israel inhabited the land; the priests told the story at the sacrificial meals, and from them it subsequently passed over to the Israelite priests.[5]

[1] Riehm. in *StKr.*, 1885, p. 329.

[2] *Cf.* the long list of Canaanite city-states in the catalogue of the successes of Thothmes III., given by Brugsch, *Gesch. Ägypt.*, p. 331 ff. (Eng. Trans. i. p. 351).

[3] *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 79 f. (Eng. Trans. i. p. 52). [4] Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 232.

[5] Rösch, *StKr.*, 1885, p. 355 f., after Stade, *ZA W.* i. p. 349.

If this was the origin of our narrative the conjecture that it was invented for the purpose of glorifying Abraham by representing him as a martial hero is materially shaken. That conjecture has no reasonable basis save in the supposition that the narrative is modern. Still more markedly is this the case if its historical character can be independently shown to be probable on other grounds, apart from the antiquity of the story.

In the first place this can be done for two of the Elamite names, the second and third, Arioch of Ellasar and Chedorlaomer of Elam. The opinion that we have here merely imaginary names and persons loses its probability in view of two facts on which Assyriologists are almost unanimous.[1] The first is that Arioch must be regarded as identical with a King Eri[m][2]-Aku of Larsa[m].[3] The second is that Chedorlaomer can be shown to be a quite probable name, on the one hand by the analogy of Kudur-Mabug, Eri-Aku's father, and on the other by the divine name Lagamar corresponding to the second half of the word. For we learn from an inscription of Assurbanipal's that in ancient times a king, who also had the prænomen Kudur, Kudur-Nanhurdi of Elam, exercised (possibly 'founded'? *circa* 2280)[4] the Elamite suzerainty over Babylon. Consequently the designation of the foreigners as Elamites, striking as it is in itself, corresponds thoroughly with the monuments, whereas it would not be easy to explain it as a late invention. Other indications[5] appear to show that Kudur-Mabug also certainly belonged to the Elamite dynasty. Hence it must be looked on as established that Kudur-Lagamar belonged to that dynasty, although his name has not yet been found.[6] This has been further confirmed by the discovery that Lagamar is the name of a specifically Elamite-Susian idol. It may possibly be inferred that Kudur-Lagamar was the elder

[1] Tiele is the only one, so far as I know, who has recently expressed doubts, see *ut supra*, p. 124.

[2] Schrader, *Iri-Aku*; Tiele, *Erim-Agû*.

[3] Schrader, *Larsav*.

[4] Frd. Delitzsch, *Calwer Bibellex*. p. 170; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, p. 164; Tiele, *Bab.-Ass. Gesch.*, p. 118.

[5] Schrader, *KAT.*[2] pp. 135, 137 (Eng. Trans. i. 120, 122).

[6] Thus also Meyer, § 136.

brother of Eriaku, seeing that Gen. xiv. represents him as a contemporary of Eriaku, the son of Kudur-Mabug.

Another important point is that at least traces of the campaign described in Gen. xiv. are met with in the tradition recorded on the monuments. The Elamite king mentioned above calls himself king of Martu—the West—which implies a conquering campaign of the Elamites against Syria, and Palestine.[1] Moreover, he appears as king of Sumir, Accad and Ur, that is, as the supreme king to whom Eriaku would stand in the relation of a vassal prince so long as his father lived. If we might assume that Kudur-Lagamar was a Kuduride of the same dynasty, older brother, say, to Eriaku, the commanding position towards the other kings taken by the Chedorlaomer of the Bible would be explained.[3] F. Hommel believes that the campaign may be dated approximately 2150 B.C.[4]

This being the state of the case it seems to me to be in the highest degree probable that in Gen. xiv. we have a historical reminiscence of ancient date. At any rate this theory enables us far more easily to imagine how the passage originated than the other hypothesis does. The latter traces our story back in the most forced, nay almost impossible, manner to the historical learning of a Jew who lived in the Exile.

Perhaps nothing more can be said about the names of the defeated kings, the signification of which defies explanation, except that they are possibly unintelligible Hebraized foreign names. In any case the explanations proposed by the Rabbis, and partially adopted by Hitzig and Nöldeke, according to which they mean villain, rogue, etc., are humorous fancies rather than scientific etymologies. On the other hand, if the campaign of the Elamites is a fact, we are not entitled to speak of an absurd plan of cam-

[1] This is opposed by Tiele, *ut supra*, p. 124. But his own view is merely conjectural; on the other side, *cf.* the campaigns of Sargon I. against Syria: Tiele, p. 114 (113).

[2] Schrader, *KAT.*[2] p. 135 (Eng. Tr. i. 121).

[3] Gen. xiv. 4 f.

[4] *Die Semit. Völk. und Spr.*, i. p. 342; whereas he formerly brought it down to about the year 1700, *Münch. Allg. Z.* 1880, No. 112; also in the *Abriss der Bab.-Ass. Gesch.*, p. 3

[5] As Meyer does, p. 166.

paign,[1] seeing that we do not know enough about the extent of their dominion in 'the west land,' or the events contemporary with this campaign. And the text of the narrative shows plainly enough that it is not describing a victory over the enemy in pitched battle or a battle of nations. It is a mere surprise of the enemy's rearguard and a recovering of a portion of their booty. For this purpose Abraham's three hundred and eighteen picked servants, aided by the forces of his allies, were sufficient. To the existence of one of these allied tribes, that of Mamre, testimony is in all probability borne by the well-known list of the Palestinian populations conquered by Thothmes III.[2] It is an indication of the historical character of our tradition that the name of this old South-Canaanite region is mentioned nowhere in the Old Testament except in Genesis. Hence it would seem that even as a place, Mamre had no later existence. This appears to exclude the possibility of later events having been transferred in legendary form to the earliest period.

The portion of Gen. xiv. which treats of the enigmatical figure of Melchizedek, has been very largely revised by R. Yet the balance of evidence is in favour of its being regarded as historical. It is not correct to speak of the name as the product of invention. Melchizedek is doubtless an old Canaanite or Phœnician name of the same form and meaning as Adoni-zedek.[3] It is open to doubt whether the Moloch or Adon on the one hand or the Zedek on the other, is the proper name of the divinity. Both views have found representatives.[4] In any case the analogy before us is far from justifying the assertion that the name is unhistoric. The twofold dignity of priest-king which is ascribed to Melchizedek in Gen. xiv. is just as little in favour of that assertion. For not only have we

[1] On this *cf.* Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 232, and especially Hommel, *Bab.-Ass. Gesch.*, p. 170, where the movement here mentioned is brought into connection with the Hyksos.

[2] Marmaama, in Brugsch, *Gesch. Ägyp.*, p. 333 (Eng. Trans. i. 351), No. 85. Less confidently, Wiedemann, *Ägyp. Gesch.*, p. 349.

[3] Joshua x. 1. See below, § 29.

[4] For one of them, *cf.* E. Nestle, *Isr. Eigennamen*, p. 175 ff; for the other, W. v. Baudissin, *Stud. z. sem. Religionsgeschichte*, i. p. 15.

in Moses' father-in-law, Reuel-Jethro, such a priest-prince of very ancient date,[1] but the history of Egypt presents us with an entire period (Twenty-first Dynasty) of priest-kings.[2] Still less permissible is it to found the doubt of Melchizedek's being a historical personage on the statement that he worshipped the Most High God (El-elyon). El-elyon seems to have been a primitive Semitic name of the deity and therefore contains nothing artificial and nothing that would be impossible in Abraham's time. In fact, El=Il is the oldest divine name common to the Babylonians, Assyrians, Phœnicians and Sabæans.[3] Babylonians as well as Phœnicians acknowledge a most high God, the latter even in name, the former at all events in fact.[4] We do not say that their god is the same as Abraham worshipped. But he stood nearer than any other to Abraham's god and therefore could most easily be acknowledged by the patriarch. For this monolatric title 'most high God' did at any rate mark a higher stage than that of the grossest heathenism.

§ 17. *The Original Home of Abraham and the Hebrews.*[5]

Comparison of the sources has shown us that they are in complete agreement as to the derivation of Abraham and his tribe from the Aramæan north-east (Haran : Charræ). On the other hand, the examination of the sources has shown that though E and the main stream of the Yahvistic source do not mention a more remote home of Abraham's, J and especially[6] P have preserved a more exact recollection. According to them, Haran is only a station of Abraham's on the road from his proper home to Canaan.

[1] See Rösch, *ut supra*, p. 338. [2] Justi, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, p. 219.

[3] Nöldeke in *Sitz.-Ber. d. Berl. Akad. d. W.*, 1880, p. 760 ff. ; Meyer, *Gesch. der Alt.* i. 173 ff. ; *cf. ZA W.* vi. p. 5. ; also Lagarde, *Orient.* ii. p. 3 ff. ; *Mittheil.* i. p. 94 ff.

[4] See the proofs in Rösch, *ut supra*, p. 342 ; *cf.* also Num. xxiv. 16.

[5] For more particulars see my article, *Die Herkunft der Herbräer nach dem AT.*, in *ThStW.* vii. (1886), pp. 187-220. *Cf.* also Brown, in the *Journ. of Soc. of Bib. Lit. and Exeg.*, 1887, p. 46 ff. ; Winckler, *Unters. zur altorient. Gesch.*, p. 66 ff. ; and Dillmann, *Gen.*[6] p. 214 f.

[6] The words מאור כשׂדים, Gen. xi. 31*b*, can in no case be taken away from P ; *cf.* Budde, *Urgesch.*, p. 427, and *ThStW.* vii. pp. 190 f., 220.

This true home of his is here called Ur Kasdim. The question is whether and in what way these data can be harmonised.

Assyriology has long believed itself to have discovered the Biblical Ur Kasdim in the ancient Babylonian seat of culture, Uru, on the Lower Euphrates.[1] The city of Uru corresponds to the present heap of ruins at Mugheir.[2] The facts brought out by Assyriologists preclude all doubt as to the existence of a place and kingdom called Uru in the land which afterwards belonged to the Chaldees. But this affords no proof of the identity of this Ur with the Biblical Ur of Abraham.[3] Their identity could not be confidently maintained unless the tenor of the Biblical statements led us to think that Abraham started from a district in the south of Babylonia. But this is not the case.

It is clear that P did not look for Ur Kasdim in the district where the Ur of south Babylonia lies, for the following reasons:

1. There can be no doubt that the genealogy given by P in Gen. xi. 10 ff. takes for granted the gradual onward movement of the Semites of Arpachsad's line from the north of Armenia to Mesopotamia. They then finally move straight on to Haran, and make a temporary stay there.

2. The name Kasdim is indeed mainly used of the population inhabiting the south of Babylonia. But it has been demonstrated that a tribe of Chaldeans[4] also dwelt in Armenia, in the

[1] Schrader, *KAT.*[2] p. 129 ff. (Eng. Trans. i. 114 ff.); *KGF.*, p. 94 ff.; and in Riehm's *HWB.*, Art. 'Ur Kasdim;' Delitzsch, *Parad.*, pp. 200, 226 f.; Hommel, *Gesch. Ass. und Bab.*, p. 115 (map).

[2] For the position of Mugheir see the map in Schrader's *KAT.* and that in Hommel's *Gesch. Assyr.*, p. 115.

[3] Besides Halévy. *Cf.* also now Tiele, *Bab.-Ass. Gesch.*, p. 85.

[4] Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 194; Justi, *Gesch. des Altert.*, Map on p. 119; also Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 126, allows at least the possibility. Somewhat differently now in Dillmann, *Gen.*[6] 195 f. But the entire question assumes a new aspect if the statements from the Armenian Cuneiform Inscriptions can be supported. *Cf.* especially Sayce, 'The Cuneif. Inscrip. of Van,' *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*, xiv. p. 377 ff., and Lehmann, *Zeitschr. für Ethnologie*, 1892, p. 128 ff. *Chaldis* (Haldis) are there spoken of (חלדים?). It is therefore no longer allowable to talk of Armenian Chaldaeans (כשדים). The statements of Xenophon and Stephen of Byzantium (see Lehmann, *ut supra*, p. 131) thus receive a striking confirmation. But it becomes so much the more difficult to make use of them in determining the locality of Ur Kasdim.

land near the Upper Tigris. Possibly the second half of the name Arpachsad refers to them.[1] Xenophon, too, mentions Chaldeans in Armenia, and although Strabo identifies these with the Chalybes it does not follow that Xenophon himself[2] confounded the two. It was Strabo who did this, and his error does not invalidate Xenophon's statement.

3. In harmony with Gen. xi. 10 ff. (see No. 1) P states that the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat,[3] which must be in the north or north-west of Assyria. Accordingly he makes that the starting-point of the subsequent history and spread of mankind. It is therefore almost impossible to imagine him suddenly transplanting the Semites to the mouth of the Euphrates, and making this their starting-point, simply to bring them back again to the place where they once stood with Serug.

The same considerations apply to J, but with even additional force. Here too, at all events in the J^2 stratum, we meet with the name Ur Kasdim.[4] J does not state where the ark landed. Budde has therefore now adopted the view that this source must have meant a mountain in the south of the land of the Two Rivers,[5] corresponding to the Babylonian tradition of Mount Nizir. From this point Noah's descendants will then have pressed on to Ur, in the not very far distant south of Babylonia. Terah and Abraham are then supposed to have wandered to Haran. I doubt whether this conjecture is adapted to solve the difficulty. Its probability is diminished by the fact that we are acquainted with a native Assyrio-Babylonian tradition, which places the mountain where the ark landed considerably farther to the north[6] (in the Gordian mountain-range). This shews that another site for the landing of the ark, beside that in South Babylonia, is quite within the bounds of possibility. And the assertion that

[1] So Ewald, Gesenius, Dillmann. On the reference to the name כשד see *ThStW.* vii. p. 216 ff.

[2] So Schrader in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 1702.

[3] *Cf.* against Reuss, Budde, *Urgesch.*, p. 269 ff.

[4] This refutes the suspicion that the name is a later interpolation, expressed by Wellhausen, *Proleg.*[2] p. 330 (Eng. Trans. p. 313), after Lagarde.

[5] Budde, *Urgesch.*, p. 438.

[6] Berossus; *cf.* Budde, p. 435.

the mountains of Ararat are entirely unsupported by tradition, and are a mere scholastic tradition,[1] is seen to be groundless.

But the idea that the mountain on which the ark grounded was in the south is found worthless when we remember that it does not make it any easier to understand how J should represent Ur as being in South Babylonia. In the first place it is a fact that J (J [1] and J [2]), as well as P, knows that the pre-Abrahamic Semites dwelt in the north. What a marvellous zig-zag we must ascribe to J [2] if we make him take the Semites from the mountain in the south on which they landed, to Mesopotamia in the north (Pelug, Serug), thence to Ur-Mugheir, and thence to Haran. Budde himself acknowledges that the route in P, Ararat, Ur-Mugheir, Haran, constitutes a difficulty.[2] How much more must he feel the difficulty in J!

Thus it becomes clear:—for the connection and the understanding of the sources P and J the equation Ur = Mugheir is valueless. It is absolutely impossible to understand how these two sources could have harmonised the origin of Abraham in South Babylonia with the rest of their statements. But, as we have seen above, all our sources (whether mentioning Haran or not) point to the Mesopotamian north, the land of Aram. And Ur, in the south of Babylonia, agrees neither with Isa. xli. 9 nor with Deut. xxvi. 5. It may therefore be confidently believed that the origin of the Hebrews from Southern Babylonia finds no support in Biblical tradition. The consentient testimony of the sources leads us rather to look for their native land in Aram, the Mesopotamian north, whither they may perhaps have emigrated from the mountain regions that lie still farther north.

§ 18. *The Immigration of the Hebrews into Egypt.*

The sources found in our Hexateuch unanimously assert that Abraham's descendants, after living for an undefined period in Canaan, passed over to Egypt and settled there. On this, as on

[1] Budde, p. 450. [2] *Urgesch.*, p. 438.

other statements, criticism has fastened, and the opinion has recently been propounded that a settlement of the ancestors of Israel in Egypt is altogether improbable, or, at any rate, in the highest degree uncertain.[1]

The point chiefly relied on is the supposed total absence of native Egyptian statements respecting the presence of the Hebrews. When we come to the history of Joseph and of Moses we shall have to inquire whether there is this perfect blank which people are now inclined to assume. Our task would be greatly lightened if we were at liberty to identify the designation '*Apuriu* which is found in the Egyptian records with 'Ibrim,' and attach it directly to the Israelites.[2] This would settle the question as to the latter having lived in Egypt. The possibility seems all the more tempting, seeing that we have two hieratic papyri at Leyden, according to which these 'Apuriu were not only a people subject to the Egyptians, but were actually employed in severe forced labours, just in the same way as the Book of Exodus relates of the Israelites.[3] But linguistic and historical reasons render this identification of 'Apuriu and Hebrews so doubtful[4] that it would at least be difficult to rely thereon for a historical determination of the abode of the Hebrews in Egypt.[5]

Yet if we leave aside the name 'Apuriu, the fact is certain that from ancient times, and therefore doubtless in those days which would correspond with the immigration of the Hebrews under Joseph, Semites frequently wandered into Egypt from the Peninsula of Sinai. We know from the Egyptian monuments that the fertile land of Egypt was from of old the granary of the surrounding nations, and that the productive Nile Valley repeatedly

[1] Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 128 f.; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.* i. p. 348; Justi, *Gesch. d. Orient. V.*, p. 272.

[2] Chabas, *Mélanges Égyptol.* i. p. 42 f.; *Rech. p. serv.*, etc., p. 142 ff.; Ebers, *ÄgBMos.*, p. 316; Gosen,[2] p. 505 f. *Cf.* further Wiedemann, *Äg. Gesch.*, p. 491. [3] Brugsch, *Gesch. Ägypt.*, p. 541 (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 88).

[4] *Cf.* especially Brugsch, *ut supra*, p. 582 f. (Eng. Trans. ii. 129); further, Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch.*, i. p. 240 f.

[5] We shall have to speak of Naville's latest excavations and their results when we reach the history of Moses.

attracted the longing gaze of the Bedouins who lived sparely in the desert-district of the north.[1] When the Hebrew tradition itself mentions that the patriarchs who preceded Joseph several times took refuge in Egypt in periods of famine, this certainly comes from old recollections, although we are no longer in a position to indicate precisely the several occasions. It is true that tribes such as the 'Amu and Shashu are named on the monuments as having paid such visits, whilst the Hebrews are not mentioned. But this is not to be wondered at, considering how many such foreign immigrations took place, especially during the Middle Egyptian Kingdom. There is not a single statement in the old Egyptian monuments which can be unhesitatingly explained as referring to the immigration of the so-called *Hyksos*. Yet this was of far more significance to Egypt than that of the Hebrews. To determine when and whence the Hyksos came we have to depend almost entirely on late and inadequate information. The monuments do not even give their name. This being so, it is simply marvellous how the silence of the monuments with respect to the Hebrews could have been adduced as a weighty argument against their having stayed in Egypt. And what robs this evidence of any pretence to validity is the fact that we can indicate reasons which forbade Egyptian national pride to mention the immigration and exodus of the Hebrews. 'To depict these events would have involved the humiliating confession that God had punished them; a patriotic writer living in the court of the Pharaohs could not easily have brought himself to this.'[2] And it is at the same time almost incredible that a people whose national sentiment was so developed, so almost arrogant, as was the case with the Hebrews, would have invented the fiction of a long-continued, shameful bondage suffered by their forefathers.[3]

Moreover, there is no event in the entire history of Israel that has more deeply imprinted itself in the memory of later generations of this people than the abode in Egypt and the exodus from the

[1] Ebers, *ÄgBMos.*, pp. 98 f., 196, 256 f.
[2] Brugsch, *ut supra*, p. 583 (Eng. Trans. ii. 130).
[3] See Ebers, in *Münch. Äg. Zeit.*, 1885, No. 110.

land of the Nile.[1] Samuel, Saul, Solomon, almost David himself, stand in the background compared with the Egyptian house of bondage and the glorious deliverance thence. Evidently we have here no mere creation of the legends of the patriarchs, but a fact which lived deep down in the consciousness of the people in quite early times from Hosea and the Book of Samuel onwards, a fact graven deep in their memory. It would betoken a high and more than normal degree of deficiency of historical sense in the Israelite national character, if a purely mythical occurrence gave the key-note of the whole national life and formed the starting-point of the entire circle of religious thought as early as the days of the first literary prophets.

§ 19. *The Personality of Joseph.*

If we have thus ascertained that the children of Israel actually dwelt in Egypt, we may also expect to find a core of historical fact in the ancient tradition about Joseph. Recent authors have with good reason shown an inclination to recognise in the history of Joseph a more than ordinary number of historical reminiscences.[2] In the earliest conflicts of Israel, we see the lead taken by the tribe of Joseph[3] or the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh,[4] which were descended from him. That cannot be accidental. It must be the reflection of an old recollection dating from the earliest days of the Hebrew nationality. But Joseph owes this subsequent leadership to the position of initiative and rule which he held in Egypt.

It need hardly be said that the history of Joseph is not to be

[1] *Cf.*, *eg.*, 1 Sam. ii. 27 ; vi. 6 ; Amos ix. 7 ; Hos. xi. 1 ; xii. 14 ; xiii. 4 ; Isa. x. 24 ; Micah vi. 3 f. ; vii. 15 ; Jer. ii. 6 ; vii. 25 ; Ezek. xx. 6 f. ; Isa. xliii. 16 f. ; li. 9 ff. ; lxiii. 11.

[2] Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] i. p. 580 ff. (Eng. Trans. p. 405 ff.), Ebers, *ÄgBMos.*, p. 256 ; Dillm. *Gen.*[5] pp. 397 f., 438 f. ; Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 64 ; Brugsch, *Gesch. Äg.*, p. 243 ff. (Eng. Trans. i. 261 ff.) ; Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 293 (with reservations).

[3] Judges i. 22 ff. ; Josh. xvii. 14 ff., and below, § 27, No. 2.

[4] Judges viii. 1 f. ; ix. 1 f. ; xii. 1 f. *Cf.* Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 341 (Eng. Trans. p. 323) ; Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 64.

taken as a mere record of family history.[1] When he emigrated into Egypt his tribesmen[2] were certainly with him, and we shall doubtless be justified in regarding his immigration and that of his tribe as precisely parallel to the movements of other Semitic tribes, known to us from the tombs of Beni-Hasan and elsewhere, who made their way into the Nile Valley. It is impossible to state definitely the cause of Joseph's migration. The most obvious supposition, according both with the idea of the family history and the characteristics of nomad tribes, is a disagreement with the other Abrahamic tribes which compelled Joseph to turn southwards. Perhaps we should not go far wrong in ascribing the flight into Egypt to undeserved hostility and treachery practised by his brother-tribes against Joseph.[3] In any case we may hold to this as a settled and historical feature of the tradition; the tribe of Joseph, driven out by the rest, reached Egypt in a mean position, made its way there to power and dignity, drew its brother-tribes after it, and then gained the leadership over them.

We regard Joseph then as having been the chief of a tribe, and seek to lift his history in part, like that of the other patriarchs, out of the narrow frame of a mere popular picture of family life. The history of Abraham has already shown that we are not thus precluded from believing that such a person as Joseph really lived. As to the name, indeed, opinions might differ, for it is admitted that Joseph is the ancient name of a tribe which disappeared afterwards. There is still more room for discussion as to the relationship which the tradition asserts between this tribal chief and Abraham and Jacob. Frequently enough these family relations are but the forms in which the larger tribal relations are expressed. But there must have existed some such person as the Joseph depicted in Genesis. The tribe of Joseph which

[1] Ewald, i.[3] p. 580 ff. (Eng. Trans., i. p. 405 ff.); Ebers, *ÄgBMos.*, p. 255; Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 397; Reuss, *Gesch. d. AT.*, p. 64.

[2] *Cf.* especially Ed. Meyer's interesting article in *ZAW.* vi. (1886), p. 1 ff. He believes that in the well-known list of the tribes subdued by Thothmes III. he has found, in addition to the name Jacob, that for Joseph (ישפאר; ר=ל), in the form Joseph-el. On this see above, § 4, No. 1.

[3] Reuss, *ut supra*, p. 64.

immigrated into Egypt must certainly have possessed a prominent chieftain who stood in a special relation to Egypt. Tradition gives him the same name as the tribe.

The history of Joseph evinces a close acquaintance with Egyptian affairs and customs. Ebers,[1] especially, has set this forth with much knowledge and care. This has been a favourite argument for the historic existence of Joseph, and the truthfulness of the account Genesis gives of him. It is evident that the fact, however valuable in itself, cannot be admitted to prove the case completely. It only shows that our author or authors were well acquainted with Egypt. There is indeed more force in the appeal to this fact when such a critical view of our documents is taken as we have so far maintained than there was when the Pentateuch was held to be a literary unity. In opposition to that view it was comparatively easy to maintain that an author who knew Egypt, and had perhaps lived there for a while, composed the story of Joseph, and clothed it in an Egyptian garb. This account of the matter is almost impossible now that two distinct main sources for the history of Joseph, J and E, are universally recognised. The sources vary so widely from each other that they must have been written at different times and places. They contain many differences of no small importance, so that they can hardly be traced back to a common literary original, yet they agree completely in bearing the genuine Egyptian stamp. It must also be admitted that the Egyptian element in the narrative cannot be mere literary colouring. It must belong to the core of the narrative. This points to a comparatively high antiquity and testifies to the existence of an ancient tradition, dating as far back as the Egyptian period itself. The Egyptian colouring of the narrative does not immediately prove its historical reliableness, but the proof of that reliableness is materially supported by a noteworthy argument in favour of its high antiquity.

Brugsch[2] has ascribed especial importance to the account

[1] *Ägypten und d. BB. Mosis*; see also Riehm in *HWB.* Art. 'Josef.'
[2] *Gesch. Ägypt.*, p. 244 ff. (Eng. Trans. i. 257 ff.)

which he brought to light of a long-continued famine in Egypt. It is contained in an inscription at El-Kab in the grave of a certain Baba, whom Brugsch has shown to have very probably been the father of the well-known admiral Aahmes. The Nile overflows with such extraordinary regularity as to make a really long-continued famine one of the rarest of events. Brugsch, therefore, believes that the famine here recorded may be very confidently identified with that of seven years' duration which Genesis connects with the name of Joseph.

Another point is that the period in which Brugsch places this famine comes well within those general limits of time to which Joseph's abode in Egypt must belong. Nor is this affected by our decision as to whether the period of Ra-Saqenen is to be connected with that of King Apepi, or whether the latter name shall be given up (see below). We know, indeed, that Aahmes, who is said to have played a great part under his namesake Aahmes I., founder of the Eighteenth Dynasty, was born under King Ra-Saqenen of the Seventeenth Dynasty.[1] This would make Ra-Saqenen of the Seventeenth Dynasty to be Joseph's Pharaoh. But we have another ancient account, according to which Joseph reached Egypt in the days of a king called Apepi. Brugsch, therefore, brings the two data into agreement by the hypothesis that the Hyksos king,[2] Ra-Saqenen, with whom Joseph had to do, ruled contemporaneously with the native king, Apepi, and the dynasty was reckoned, in the national Egyptian sources, after the name of the latter.[3] Wiedemann, on the contrary, takes no account of this famine, believes it to be, at least, probable that Joseph's elevation took place under King Apepi [I.], and reckons this monarch as belonging to the Sixteenth Dynasty. According to this view the two dynasties were not contemporaneous, and Joseph's date falls a little earlier

[1] Weidemann, *ut supra*, p. 301.

[2] Lepsius, *Chronol.* i. p. 389 ff., and *PRE.*[2] i. p. 174, and Ebers, *ÄgBMos.*, p. 260, pronounce against the idea of an immigration under a Hyksos king. But the Hyksos, at all events, adopted the Egyptian language and manners.

[3] Brugsch, *ut supra*, p. 247 (Eng. Trans. i. 260).

than Brugsch would make it, about 1842, Brugsch giving 1750. It is impossible to decide the point.

We do not hesitate to admit that the coincidence of the time of the famine with the conjectural date of Joseph, together with the extraordinary infrequency of great famines in Egypt,[1] seems to us to be of real weight in favour of the identification of the two famines, and consequently in support of the history of Joseph generally. The only plausible objection is the general uncertainty in our determination of the dates connected with the Middle Egyptian Kingdom. But that uncertainty applies to Aahmes (whose connection with Baba hardly admits of dispute) far less than to most of the other persons and epochs of the period.

The native Egyptian monuments do then at least render it highly probable that there was a famine in Joseph's time. For the rest of his history, however, and especially for his successes in Egypt, we are not in the same position. Above all else we have no ancient Egyptian account of Joseph's famous financial measures, by which the entire country, excepting the estates of the priests, was made crown property, and the people were bound as a sort of serfs to cultivate the king's land and pay the fifth of the produce as rent. At any rate we know that these statements correspond on the whole with the picture given us in other sources of the constitution and administration of Egypt.[2] But the monuments neither inform us that the fifth was the proportion paid nor mention the name of the author of the plan. The Greek narrators, Herodotus and Diodorus,[3] equally fail to supply certain information on the point. But it seems to us that one fixed datum is furnished by a discrepancy between these two Greek authors and

[1] In opposition to which it would not be well to adduce such passages as Isa. xiv 5 ff., Zech. xiv. 18 (Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch.* i. p. 158), which do not refer to actual events, but to possibilities expressed in prophetical language.

[2] Herod. ii. 109: Sesostris divided the land amongst all the Egyptians, so that each received an equal quadrilateral portion, from which the king then derived his revenue in the shape of an annual tribute. Further, *e.g.*, Ebers, in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 326.

[3] I refer to the thorough treatment of this subject, where all the passages are discussed, in Riehm, *HWB.*, p. 763.

the Biblical story. The latter states that the priests were not under the necessity of selling their lands, because they received their maintenance from the king. To this corresponds the fact that the priests always appear in ancient Egyptian narratives as great landowners.[1] But it does not seem to harmonise with this when both Herodotus and Diodorus[2] mention the *warriors* as landowners, together with the king and priests. Herodotus,[3] however, relates that an earlier king than Sethos handed over to the military class their estates, and that Sethos took them back again. Diodorus,[4] on the other hand, gives to the first of these kings the very name Sesostris. Hence, whatever may have been the historical relation between the two kings,[5] Sethos and Sesostris, it is clear that Diodorus agreed with Herodotus in believing that at an earlier period none but the priests and the king held land. The classical writers and Genesis are therefore quite at one on this matter. As, then, the classics admit of the belief that the military class were made landowners at a comparatively early date, it follows that the reminiscence which the Old Testament has preserved on this point also is very ancient. Our narrative must go back beyond the times of the Sesostris of Diodorus, and the credibility of at least its leading statements is thus proved probable.[6]

[1] Ebers, in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 326.

[2] Herod. ii. 168; Diod. i. 73 f.

[3] Herod. ii. 141.

[4] Herod. i. 54. According to the context the passage can only refer to the estates handed over to the military class.

[5] Sesostris is usually looked on as a blending of Sethi I. and Rameses II. (Ebers in Riehm's *HWB.*, p. 332).

[6] On the opposite side, *cf.* Kuenen, *Theol. Tijdschr.* v. (1871) p. 266 ff., where, however, reference is made only to Herod. ii. 109 and Diod. i. 54, 57. The discrepancies within the Biblical narrative itself (p. 268 ff.) prove nothing, for the question is not as to the form, but as to the essential contents of the account.

CHAPTER II.

MOSES AND THE JOURNEY THROUGH THE DESERT.

I. THE TRADITION IN THE SOURCES.

§ 20. *J's Narrative.*

ALMOST everywhere from Exodus to Joshua the two oldest sources, J and E, are utilised with such freedom by the Deuteronomic editor as to make it much more difficult to keep them apart than it is in Genesis. We might therefore be inclined to abandon in despair the attempt at a searching analysis, and to base our historical investigation on that form of their union and blending which lies before us in the Deuteronomic edition (R^d, Wellhausen's JE). But as a matter of fact such abundant traces of those original sources come to light as to compel the historian to fix his attention on each by itself whenever the two oldest accounts can be distinguished. Hence we prefer to venture once more on the attempt to hear separately the reports of these two documents. This will naturally fail to issue in a perfectly reliable conclusion as to some points, but in the weightiest events of the Mosaic history it yields many an interesting and surprising result. I cannot hold J to be older than E, but I put it first here because in many respects it strikes the key-note, and several general questions are brought to an issue in dealing with it better than in E.

J's Writing, at all events, contained some statement respecting the increase of Jacob's descendants in Egypt and the measures taken against them by Pharaoh, especially the order to slay the

male children of the Israelites. But it is difficult to make out with certainty the traces of this narrative in the context as it now stands. Here, and in the sequel, they are only to be seen in single fragments.[1] Naturally they allow us to infer the existence at one time of a fuller narrative, running parallel to the one we now have from E.

A still-existing remnant[2] shows that J also had an account of the exposure of Moses and his being found and adopted by Pharaoh's daughter. When Moses is grown up he slays an Egyptian and flees to Midian. Here he dwells with Reuel, the priest of Midian, whose daughter, Sippora, he wins to wife. She bears him Gershom.[3] The angel of the Lord appears to him on Sinai in a burning bush and reveals to him Yahvé's purpose of delivering Israel out of the hand of the Egyptians and leading them into the land of the Canaanites. Moses is to return to Egypt and make known to the people[4] Yahvé's resolve. He is at the same time to demand from Pharaoh permission for the people to go three days' journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to Yahvé. With this, however, the prospect is set before him that Pharaoh will not willingly let them go.[5] Moses endeavours to evade Yahvé's commission by objecting that the people will not believe him. By way of credentials Yahvé therefore gives him three signs which he is to perform before Israel: the staff which he casts on the ground becomes a serpent; his hand, placed in his bosom, becomes leprous; Nile water, which he is to pour out, shall become blood. Moses objects a second time, saying that he is of a slow tongue. Yahvé meets this with the question: 'Who hath given speech to man?' and the assurance that He will be with him.[6]

The final despondent refusal of Moses:[7] 'Send whom Thou

[1] At least Exod. i. 22 (against Dillmann) and 20*b* (against Kuenen) belong to these; possibly also some words in *v.* 14. [2] Exod. ii. 6.

[3] Exod. ii. 11-14 (Wellh. against Dillm.), 16-23.

[4] In place of the communication to the elders it probably stood thus originally in J.

[5] Parts of Exod. iii. 2 (especially 2*aα*); further, iii. 4*a*, 7 f. (probably excepting 8*bβ*), 16*b*-22 (leaving out some small portions in this section, especially in *v.* 18).

[6] Exod. iv. 1-12. [7] Exod. iv. 13-16; *cf.* Wellh. xxi. p. 541.

wilt send.' is answered wrathfully by Yahvé, who says that Aaron is now coming to meet him and shall speak what Moses puts in his mouth. Whether this belongs to the original context depends on our view of the further appearance of Aaron in this connection. Affecting as it does the entire historical position and significance of Aaron, the question demands a somewhat detailed discussion. Both in J and E Moses himself is his own spokesman before Pharaoh, whereas in P Aaron speaks and acts for Moses as the latter directs. A glance at the text before us is enough to show that Aaron is introduced suddenly, in a somewhat unceremonious fashion and a somewhat dilapidated context. This suggests the suspicion that the editor may have interpolated the passage. And the suspicion appears to be confirmed by the fact that almost always after Moses has spoken, Pharaoh suddenly assumes that Aaron is present, and usually addresses Moses and Aaron, whereas Moses alone then comes in again as the intercessor.[1] Wellhausen[2] has thus been led to the conclusion that the introduction of Aaron is due to the Yehovist (JE) who 'deemed Aaron's assistance especially suitable on occasions of intercession.' But we have seen more than one reason for doubting the existence of Wellhausen's JE. And his interposition on this particular occasion is all the more open to doubt if neither J nor E knew of Aaron's co-operation here. JE cannot have brought in Aaron as a pure invention. If it is imagined that we have here an editorial interpolation, it must have been made by R^d or R^h from P. For the latter source is the only one that lays such stress on Aaron's co-operation as might have led an editor who was familiar with this source to attempt to adjust other narratives to it. But the way and manner of Aaron's appearance in the text renders it more than doubtful to me whether we have here an instance of a mere editor's activity. If an editor ascribed special importance to Aaron's presence because he was inclined to attribute to Aaron

[1] *Cf.* Exod. vii. 14. 26 : viii. 16 : ix. 1. 13 : with viii. 4. 21. 24 ; ix. 27, 28 : x. 3. 8. 11. 16, on the one hand, and with viii. 5. 22. 25 : ix. 29, and viii. 8, 26 : ix. 33 ; x. 18, on the other.

[2] *JDTh.* xi. pp. 538. 541.

a leading part in the entire affair, he would have had to introduce the missing name everywhere, or, at all events, whenever Moses came before Pharaoh. But this is just what he does not do. This proves that we have an original text to deal with, and not a designed editorial correction.

It appears to me, after all is said, to be possible that the preliminary announcement of the co-operation of Aaron the Levite, in chap. iv. 13-16, was slightly altered[1] by the last editor or the Deuteronomic editor in conformity with the text of P in its original condition. Chap. iv. 27-31 may also be due to this later hand.[2] But I think the events that happened in Pharaoh's presence are narrated in precise accordance with the original sources. The casual, accidental, and unpretentious manner in which Aaron is mentioned speaks decidedly in favour of this view. In opposition to it the question, it is true, may be raised, whether we have not here another instance of a twofold current within J,[3] one of which thought of the occurrence without Aaron, whilst the other presupposed his co-operation.[4] In any case, Aaron the Levite seems to belong to the original form of J, as this source now lies before us.

In obedience to Yahvé's command, Moses returns to Egypt.[5] Yahvé meets him on the way and threatens him with death—apparently because Moses is not circumcised. He does not leave him alone until Zipporah has circumcised their son with a flint and touched Moses with the child's foreskin.[6]

[1] This is indicated by the dilapidation of the context and by the representation of Aaron as not only present on this occasion, but also speaking.

[2] The elders of Israel and Aaron are here placed beside Moses. In this context the former remind us of E, the latter of J.

[3] See also Bruston, *Les deux Jéhovistes*, in *Revue de Théol. et Phil.*, 1885, p. 6.

[4] Vatke, *Einleit.*, p. 175, offers another solution. He holds that wherever Moses appears alone it is E that is speaking (vii. 15 would then not refer to iv. 3 f., but to an account of the first miracle by E, now lost). The second part of the narrative, where Aaron is present, has on this theory been added from J. The hypothesis would satisfactorily explain Aaron's absence at the beginning. But what about the elders, iii. 18?

[5] Exod. iv. 19 (?), and, in addition thereto, some kind of statement corresponding to v. 20*a*.

[6] Exod. iv. 24-26.

When Moses arrives in Egypt, he appears before the king (accompanied by Aaron) and demands that the people be let go into the desert to hold a feast unto Yahvé. He is rebuffed arrogantly by the king; repeats his demand next day several times in Aaron's presence, almost in the same words, announcing each time a fresh plague on the king and his land in case Pharaoh will not yield.[1] Our author assumes that these plagues are inflicted, but does not himself narrate this. For in the majority of cases Pharaoh calls Moses and Aaron into his presence and begs them pray to Yahvé to turn away the plague. But it is in harmony with this style of narrative that J assumes Moses to be not the actual executant of these plagues, Yahvé carrying them into execution, Moses simply announcing them.[2]

The final plague, the death of all the firstborn in Egypt, induces the king at last to give the order for Israel's departure. The Egyptians themselves importune Israel to leave the land. With such speed is their departure effected that they have not time to bake their bread. They take the unleavened dough with them and make cakes of it on the way. They also induce the Egyptians to give them costly vessels and garments as they are going. Thus do they set out, and Yahvé Himself points out their way, going before them by day in a pillar of cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire.[3]

It is not till after their departure that Pharaoh's officials realise the fact that Israel has not merely gone for a sacrificial feast in the desert, but has actually escaped from bondage to the Egyptians. Pharaoh assembles his army and pursues Israel. Beside the Red Sea Israel suddenly perceives the Egyptians behind them. The people murmur against Moses, who bids them look for Yahvé's

[1] Exod. v. 1*b*, 2, 4; vii. 14-17*ba* (turning of the Nile into blood); vii. 23 (Jülicher, *JPTh.*, 1882, pp. 83, 87), 25-29; viii. 4-11*a* (Frogs); viii. 16-28 (Vermin); ix. 1-7 (Murrain); ix. 13-21, 23*b* (against Vatke), 27-30 (Hail; the last verses belong to J, notwithstanding Wellhausen, Dillmann, and Vatke; the word אלהים also proves nothing here, Jül., p. 93), 33, 34; x. 1-11, 13*b*, 14*b*-20 (Locusts; a slightly different division, *cf.* Jül., p. 95); xi. 1 f. (?), 4-7 (Death of the Firstborn).

[2] *Cf.* especially Wellh. xxi. p. 533 ff.

[3] Exod. xii. 29, 30*aβb*; 31-36 (as to the main point), 39; xiii. 21 f.

help. The pillar of cloud leaves its usual place, goes behind Israel, and stands in such a position between Israel and the Egyptians, that the armies cannot approach each other during the night. Meanwhile Yahvé dries up the sea during the night by a strong east wind.[1] As the night wears on both armies cross, and the fight begins on the farther side.[2] Towards morning Yahvé throws the Egyptians into confusion by means of the pillar of fire. At the same time He clogs the wheels of their chariots, so that the Egyptians flee back in disorder, whilst the sea, returning to its wonted flow, swallows them up.[3]

From the Red Sea the people journey to the place afterwards called Massah and Meribah, where they beg Moses to give them water. Yahvé commands him: 'Pass on before the people . . . I stand before thee there upon a rock . . .'[4]

Very probably J as well as E gave the account of the defeat of the Amalekites,[5] which came from an ancient source. The next point in the narrative must have been the arrival at the Mount of God, which J calls Sinai, whereas the title Horeb is the current one in E. Thereupon Yahvé announces to Moses that He will now reveal Himself to him, and on the third day will come down on Sinai before the eyes of all the people. In a majestic theophany He descends and calls Moses up the mountain. Moses is ordered to charge the people that no one come near the mountain.[6]

2. From this point we lose the original thread of J still more completely. Obviously the editor here found in his sources large sections having precisely similar contents. In the purely historical portions of the sources it was possible to divide such sections according to their members and then work them into each other mosaic-fashion. But here this could not be done: some parts had to be omitted entirely. A very large portion of J's account of the events at Sinai seems to have suffered this fate. The part

[1] Exod. xiv. 5 f., 9*aα* (to אחריהם), 10*aba* (to מאד), 11-14, 19*b*, 20, 21*aβ*.
[2] This is not stated in the now extant text, but the sequel compels us to supply it. *Cf.* Wellh. xxi. p. 546.
[3] *Vv.* 24 f., 27*aβb*, 28*b*, 30 f.
[4] Exod. xvii. 1*bβ*, 2, 7, and the words we have quoted from *vv.* 5 and 6.
[5] Exod. xvii. 8-16.
[6] Exod. xix. (9*a*?), 11, 12, 18, 20, 21.

which survived naturally had to take a quite different place from the one which originally belonged to it. This compels us to search carefully for the fragments of J, and bring some of them together from remote places. Hence it is not to be wondered at if one or other member can only be fitted into the context by transferring[1] it from its present position to another.

R could not possibly have reported the Decalogue twice here. The fact of its only being given once is no proof of its absence from J. It is certainly a mistake to assert that the small law-book which is preserved to us in Exod. xxxiv. 11-26, is a corresponding code to that of the Decalogue, nay, that it is the original Ten Words.[2] It requires the utmost arbitrariness even to find in it the number Ten. In it we really have the surviving remnant of the 'laws and statutes,' which J as well as E placed after the Decalogue, an abbreviated analogue, that is, to chaps. xxi-xxiii. The transposition of the whole to this place needs no further explanation after what has been said above. We shall therefore not be in error if we think of the Decalogue as preceding this law-book and prefix it to chap. xxxiv. 11.

In J's narrative the course of events at Sinai may accordingly be conjectured to have run as follows. After the arrival at Sinai, and the preliminaries mentioned in chap. xix., Yahvé promulgates the Decalogue. Moses is then called up the mountain.[3] He stays there forty days and nights,[4] whilst Yahvé[5] writes for him on

[1] Dillm. *Ex Lev.*, p. 334, treats Exod. xxxiv. 11-26 in this way.

[2] See Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 551 ff.; *Gesch. Isr.*[1] p. 404 ff.

[3] Each of the main sources, J included, must have its share in the statement which occurs thrice at Exod. xxiv. 13-18: 'And Moses went up the mountain.' At xxxiv. 1 ff. another explanation is possible: see below.

[4] xxxiv. 28, a verse which is quite out of place where it now stands, belongs to this passage. It cannot possibly be the continuation of xxxiv. 27, because *v.* 27 makes xxxiv. 11-26 to have been written by Moses. For Moses cannot have spent the forty days in *writing* the commandments: it must have been in *receiving* them. But in this passage he is supposed to have received them long before. R[d] did not know what to make of the verse in the context where he found it. He therefore placed it quite at the close of his account of what happened at Sinai; where it would certainly cause some confusion.

[5] Yahvé, not Moses, is the subject of ויכתב in the original context as well as in the present one (*v.* 1). *Cf.* the frequent change of subject in this very

the tables of stone the ten covenant-words of the Decalogue. As in E God adds to the Ten Words the rest of the laws and statutes, and commands Moses to write down these words, *i.e.* the contents of these laws.[1] After their tenor the covenant is made with Israel. It is no longer possible to determine the precise part of J where the concluding of the covenant was inserted.

Meanwhile, however, the people have grown impatient at the long absence of Moses, and have compelled Aaron to make them gods who shall go before them. Aaron has made a molten calf out of the ornaments of the Israelites, and arranged a feast for it. Yahvé himself tells Moses what has happened below, and bids him go down from the mountain.[2] When he comes nigh unto the camp he casts the tables to the ground so that they are broken in pieces. He upbraids Aaron and the people for their grievous offence. On the morrow he again ascends the mountain and beseeches God for forgiveness. Yahvé declares that in due season he will punish the sin. For the present Moses and the people are to set out towards the place He has appointed, and He will send His angel before him.[3] The people mournfully strip themselves of their ornaments, out of which Moses makes the

source. Wellhausen's view (xxi. p. 554) is disproved by the fact (see above) that what *Moses* wrote has already been given in *v.* 27, so that the words of the Covenant mentioned in *v.* 28 cannot be the contents of xxxiv. 11-26. And ויכתב *v.* 1 is dead against him. Nor is anything said in *v.* 27 about either tables of stone or Ten Words. *V.* 27 is written in a book, *v.* 28 on tables of stone: *cf.* also Vatke, *Einl.*, p. 352.

[1] In Ex. xxxiv. 27, we find the following injunction: 'Write *these* words, for after the tenor of these words I have made a *covenant* with thee and with Israel.' And in xxiv. 4, 7, we read: 'And Moses wrote the *words of Yahvé* . . . and took *the book of the covenant* and read it in the audience of the people.' Comparing these two passages we see that according to *v.* 27 what is written (xxxiv. 11-26) cannot be the Ten Words but is the analogue to the Book of the Covenant now surviving in a mutilated form. Obviously the tables mentioned in *v.* 28 are not contemplated here.

[2] Exod. xxxii. 1-8. Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] pp. 244, 246, ascribes this to E^2 and E^3, but on insufficient grounds.

[3] Exod. xxxii. 19, (20), 21-24, 30-34. *V.* 30 indicates that *vv.* 9-14 are probably an addition due to R^d (Wellh. JE): but these verses may possibly be original, and consequently 30-34 an addition. At all events xxxii. 3*b*, 4 belong to this.

Tabernacle,[1] which from this time forwards must be the substitute for Yahvé's immediate presence on Sinai. Ere they depart Moses is bidden to bring two new tables up the mountain instead of those he had broken, that Yahvé may write on them anew.[2]

During their stay at Sinai, Moses had visited his father-in-law Hobab (ben Reuel).[3] . . . Now that Israel, in obedience to Yahvé's command, is leaving the holy mountain, Moses begs Hobab to act as guide to the people: he knows the camping grounds of the desert and could therefore be 'their eyes.' He promises him an abundant reward in Canaan. Hobab objects at first, but seems to have consented afterwards, for Israel in later days recognises as part of the nation a Kenite clan which traces its descent from Hobab.[4]

3. The people resume their march through the desert and murmur against Moses because they have no bread. Yahvé tells Moses that He will rain bread from heaven, but at the same time will see whether the people keep His law. They are to gather some every day except the Sabbath, but a double portion on the

[1] This must have been stated here: Wellhausen, xxi. p. 563, note. It is not easy to fit the next section, xxxiii. 12-23, into the context of the original source. Wellhausen (p. 563 f.) attributes much of it to JE. And it is quite possible that R^d or another, having made additions of his own previously, felt specially free so to do in this passage where the important subject of the reconciliation of Yahvé with Israel is dealt with. Parts of the narrative, particularly in *vv.* 19-23, may well have belonged to E originally, but still better to J. But the dilapidated state of these elements precludes the possibility of restoring the connection that existed at first.

[2] Exod. xxxiv. 1-5 (Kuenen partly E, but *cf.* סיני, *v.* 4), whereas *vv.* 6-9, may probably be an addition by R^d. Wellhausen, xxi. p. 553, sees an addition by JE in *v.* 1, from כראשנים onwards, and accordingly looks on the verse as a whole as an account of the *first* appearance of Moses on Sinai. This explanation is not absolutely necessary, but the general impression left by the verse forbids my rejecting it as altogether impossible. But even if Wellhausen is right, nothing need be set down as an editorial addition except כראשנים, and from אשר to the end of the verse. In that case we should have here the beginning of J's account of the events at Sinai, the right place for which is after chap. xix. Next would come the proclamation of the Decalogue (to Moses, not to the people). The narrative then follows the course described above.

[3] Chap. xviii. belongs to this place: *v.* 1*b*, and parts of 9-11 are J's. These remnants imply a fuller narrative, which probably corresponded to E's.

[4] Num. x. 29-32. R omits Hobab's compliance, because of Exod. xviii. 27. But *cf.* such passages as Judges i. 16; iv. 11; 1 Sam. xv. 5 f.

day before the Sabbath. Next day they perceive small grains on the ground resembling hoar-frost, and call them manna. They gather these, many of them taking more than was needed for one day; the overplus is uneatable. Thus is Israel fed by Yahvé until they reach the frontier of Canaan.[1]

But the mixed multitude which came up with Israel out of Egypt led the people to take a dislike to the manna and long for the flesh and vegetables which Egypt had supplied in abundance. Moses is displeased at this, and remonstrates with Yahvé for making him alone bear the burden of the people. Yahvé associates with him seventy of the elders of Israel whom Moses already knows and has made use of as elders and officers of the people. But He promises the people that they shall have flesh in super-abundance on the morrow. Joshua is one of the chosen seventy.[2]

When they reach Kadesh Moses sends spies into Canaan, one man from each tribe, Joshua and Caleb being of the number. They are to go into the Negeb and the mountain district and find out the nature of the land and people. They come to Hebron, which was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt (and therefore was already in existence). There the children of the giants, Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai, rule. . . . They report to Moses that they came to a land of milk and honey, but that, on the other hand, its people are strong, its cities fenced, its inhabitants giants.[3] Amalek dwells in the Negeb, the Canaanite by the sea and along the Jordan. The people are alarmed, spend the night weeping[5]

[1] The Sabbatic Law, as well as *vv.* 9 f., 23, 33 f. (Ewald., Dillm.), show that this is the place for Exod. xvi. *Vv.* 4 f., 14-16, 18*b*-21, 27-30 (? Wellh. D[2]) 35*b*. stood in J. Jülicher disagrees with this. He finds no connected narrative in Exod. xvi. save that of P.

[2] Num. xi. 4-6, 10-29, with Dillmann. But these verses (*cf. e.g.*, the number 600,000) must have been retouched. Kuenen's view, *Ond.*[2] pp. 155, 244, is quite different: he brings in E[2]: 24-19 may also belong to R[d].

[3] Num. xiii. 17*b*-19, 22, 27 (against Meyer, *ZAW.* i. p. 139; *v.* 26*bβ* is parallel and therefore not from the same source; *cf.* too the change of number, 28 f. Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] p. 151, will not hear of any narrative of J's.

[4] On this verse see Meyer, p. 124; on the other side Dillmann, who ascribes *v.* 29 to E. The decision may be doubtful.

[5] Num. xiv. 1*b* (see Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, pp. 74 f.), 3 f., 8 f., 30-33.

and murmur against Yahvé and Moses. Caleb and Joshua encourage them. But Yahvé determines to punish the people; none of them save Caleb and Joshua shall enter the promised land. The people now repent and wish to go up, but are beaten back by the Canaanite and Amalekite inhabitants[1] (as far as Hormah?).

At this time the Canaanite king of Arad comes out against Israel and takes some of them prisoners. Israel vows that, if Yahvé will give victory, the Canaanite cities shall be utterly destroyed.[2] When Yahvé afterwards delivered the Canaanites into the hand of Israel, the name of that place[3] was called Hormah.[4] . . . The people dwell many years in Kadesh, and Miriam dies there.[5] . . .

The fight with the Amorites recorded in E is not mentioned here. An indefinite but certainly long time after those events Israel at last reaches the south-east boundary of Canaan, ready to push forward against the land. Before arriving here Israel must encounter Moab. Balak, king of Moab, trembles for his possessions. In concert with that branch of the Midianites[6] which is settled in the district, Balak sends to the land of the Ammonites[7] for the soothsayer Balaam. He premises that all the treasures of Balak cannot induce him to curse Israel without Yahvé's consent, but he accompanies the messengers. On the journey his beast speaks, and he is thus miraculously made aware of God's displeasure at his going. But he is now to go on with the men, taking care to speak only what God may say to him.[8] Balak receives him and brings him to the city of Streets (Kerioth='Ar

[1] As to traces of J in Num. xiv. 19-45, see Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 80. The reading כנעני should not be absolutely rejected, as by Meyer, *ZA W.* i. 133; it is a remnant of J. חרמה and בהר do not suit J.

[2] Num. xxi. 1, 2. The verses are best understood as a direct continuation of xiv. 39 ff. Neither requires the omission of the other (Meyer). Between the two narratives Dillmann finds remnants of a history of Korah due to J.

[3] Arad itself is not the scene of the battle, but Zephath, as Judges i. 17 shows. [4] *V.* 3 is an anticipatory statement; *cf.* Judges i. 17.

[5] Num. xx. 1*aβb* (Wellh. xxi. p. 577).

[6] This indeed suggests difficulties; hence perhaps we should follow Wellhausen, xxi. p. 579, in taking it to be an interpolation from P. Against this see Dillmann, p. 141. [7] According to the reading בני עמון, Dillm., p. 142.

[8] Num. xxii. 3*a*, 4 (but see above, note 2), 5*aβ*, 7*a*, 18, *a*, 22-35*a*.

Moab?). But instead of a curse, Balaam has to pronounce a blessing on Israel.[1] Both J and E have at least two prophecies by Balaam. The present juxtaposition of the four speeches is due to the editor.

Balaam's utterances seem to have prevented Balak from bringing the matter to the arbitrament of battle. Israel consequently advances unhindered as far as Shittim and dwells there. Here the people are seduced into fornication with the Moabite women and participation in their idol-festivals. The chiefs who took part in this are punished by being cut off from the community.[2]

The two tribes, Gad and Reuben, own many cattle and therefore wish to remain here on the east of the Jordan. Moses looks on this as betraying a lack of public spirit. He will not consent to their request until they promise to fight by the side of the other tribes for the conquest of the west.[3]

Deuteronomy[4] here comes in and throws into confusion the connection of all three principal sources. The thread cannot be taken up till the end of that book. Our source closes the history of Moses in the briefest possible manner. Possibly we still have the prediction of his death[5] which it certainly once contained. But after this it hastens on to the death itself. Moses dies on the top of Pisgah, after Yahvé has shown him the whole land of Gilead as far as Dan.[6]

§ 21. *E's Narrative.*

1. After the death of Joseph and the whole of that generation a new king arises in Egypt who knows not Joseph. The sons of

[1] Num. xxiv. 2-19, 25; *cf.* xxii. 18=J. *Vv.* 20-24 is a later addition, and the three last words of *v.* 10 were added by R^d. [2] Num. xxv. 1, 2, 4.

[3] Some parts of Num. xxxii. certainly belonged to J., but the chapter has been so thoroughly retouched that it is not easy to distinguish them. We must, however, with Dillmann, ascribe to it the core of the narrative, 1*b*, 2*a*, 3, 5-13, 23, 25-27. On this see Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] p. 248.

[4] Dillmann insists that a few more verses in the Book of Numbers, viz., Num. xxxiii. 52, 55 f., come from J.

[5] Dillmann finds it in Deut. xxxi. 16-22; even if this be so, the passage has been altered.

[6] Deut. xxxiv. 1*aβb* (Dillm. *v.* 4, which, however, probably belongs to R^d).

Israel grow too numerous for his liking. He fears their joining the enemies of Egypt. They are therefore oppressed with forced labour in building Pithom and Raamses.[1] Moreover, Pharaoh orders the Hebrew midwives, Shiphrah and Puah, to kill all the Hebrew male-children as soon as they are born.[2] A married couple of the tribe of Levi therefore conceal their infant boy at first and afterwards expose him in the Nile, where Pharaoh's daughter discovers and saves him. The king's daughter brings the lad up, and calls him Mosheh because she drew him out of the water.[3] When he has reached manhood he has to flee to Midian on account of an offence which comes to Pharaoh's ears. There he becomes son-in-law to the priest Jethro.[4]

One day, whilst tending his father-in-law's sheep, he came to Horeb, the primæval mountain of God. There God appears to him in a burning bush. He reveals Himself as the God of their fathers, and bids him go to Pharaoh and demand the release of Israel from Egypt. This source, like the other, represents him as endeavouring to evade the divine commission. God promises His assistance and, as the sign of his divine mission, declares that after the people have been set free they shall serve God at this mountain. To contribute further to his gaining the confidence of the sons of Israel He tells him His name Yahvé. He bids him gather together the elders of Israel in Egypt and go with them to Pharaoh to demand Israel's release.[5] Moreover he is to take the rod of God in his hand, to work miracles with it in God's name. Moses accordingly returns to his father-in-law Jethro (Yether), and informs him of his intended departure to Egypt. Jethro dismisses him in peace.[6]

[1] Exod. i. 6 (against Kuenen and Wellhausen), 8-12.

[2] Exod. i. 15-20*a*, 21; Kuenen adds 20*b*, and Dillmann 22.

[3] Exod. ii. 1-6*a*, 7-10.

[4] Probably the only verse in chap. ii. that belongs to this narrative is *v.* 15, but it implies such an account as is given in *vv.* 11-14.

[5] Exod. iii. 1-3 (as to the chief matter), *vv.* 4*b*-6, 9-16*a*, and in *v.* 18 at least the first words after the Athnach.

[6] Exod. iv. 7 (a verse which originally formed the conclusion of a narrative by E of the signs given to Moses), 18 (Vatke, against Wellhausen), 20*b*-23. According to E (*cf.* xviii. 2*a*) Moses temporarily left his wife and child in Midian.

Moses returns to Egypt, and in company with the elders[1] of Israel goes to the king and demands that Pharaoh shall let Israel go to celebrate a feast in the wilderness. Pharaoh refuses to grant the requests, and adds to Israel's burdens. The straw for their brick-making, which has been delivered to them hitherto, is no longer to be allowed. The people reproach Moses. He turns to Yahvé, who promises help.[2]

Our author, like J, comes thus to the plagues. Of the account which he gave of these nothing but fragments remain. But they are enough to show plainly how the story ran. Moses (accompanied by the elders) comes to Pharaoh and announces that he will turn the Nile into blood with his staff, that the fishes shall die and the water become undrinkable. Pharaoh remains inflexible, and Moses carries out his threat.[3] . . . This source does not appear again until the plague of hail, when it tells how Moses, at God's command, again stretches out his rod, this time towards heaven, that it may thunder and hail: Goshen alone is spared.[4] A short account of the plague of locusts by this writer also survives. The editor places alongside it a statement, peculiar to our source, respecting the sentence of three days' darkness pronounced against the whole land of Egypt. Pharaoh is now prepared to let Israel go, but without their cattle. Moses will not accept this condition, and the king forbids him to appear again in the royal presence. He leaves with the words: 'I will not see thy face again, but thy servants shall come to *me*.'[5]

. . . We no longer possess E's account of the death of the

[1] Exod. v. 1*a*. The text of E, here and at *v.* 20, had זקני ישראל instead of אהרון, in accordance with iii. 16*a*, 18. The alteration was *here* made by R, and is due to the mention of Aaron in J and P. *Cf.* Wellh. xxi. p. 542; Dillmann, *Ex Lev.*, p. 48; Vatke, *Einl.*, p. 173.

[2] Exod. v. 3, 5-vi. 1. In *v.* 20, the original reading (see above) was: 'the elders.'

[3] Exod. vii. 17 f. (Jül.), 20*aβb*, 21*a* (against Dillmann), 24 (?).

[4] Exod. ix. 22, 23*a*, 24-26 (Wellh. xxi. p. 535), 31 f., 35*a*.

[5] Exod. x. 12, 13*aa*, 14*aa*, 21-27, 28 f. (Jül., 98, against Wellhausen, Dillmann); xi. 8 (this verse belongs to E, and this is precisely its right place, against Wellhausen, Dillmann, Jül.).

firstborn, but the context implies that there was one. Moved by this visitation, Pharaoh sends his servants to Moses in the middle of the night, to tell Israel that they may leave the land speedily. Israel accordingly sets out (from Raamses ?) to Succoth, . . . men on foot, besides women and children. Moreover, a numerous mixed population goes with them out of Egypt.[1] God does not lead Israel by the direct route through the land of the Philistines, because they are not sufficiently inured to war to meet this martial race. He bids them rather march towards the Red Sea. They take Joseph's bones with them.[2]

But Pharaoh pursues them with all his chariots, amongst which are six hundred chosen ones. God's command comes to Moses: 'Lift up thy rod, stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it, so that the children of Israel may pass through the sea on dry ground.' The angel of God then moves from the van to the rear of the host and under his protection the Israelites pass through dryshod.[3] . . .

Reaching the other side, Miriam the prophetess, Aaron's sister, takes her timbrel and the women of Israel follow her in the dance. She sings the song of triumph:

> 'Sing ye unto Yahvé, for He hath glorified Himself;
> Horse and rider cast He into the sea.'[4]

Aaron's name meets us here for the first time in E. The poem may very likely, in this form also, have contained more strophes than these two, but E has not given it in full because he was acquainted with another version of the song of triumph in a fuller form, derived from a different source. He supplies this version also, putting it into the mouth of Moses.[5] That

[1] xii. 30*aa*, and possibly some points in *vv.* 32 and 35 : the whole of *v.* 37 f. (with the probable exception of the number 600,000, and the name Raamses, which may have been inserted from P).

[2] Exod. xiii. 17-19. Kuenen adds 21 f., but this can hardly be correct.

[3] Exod. xiv. 7, 9*aγ*, 16, 19*a*, 22*a*. Here E breaks off. *Cf.* also Josh. xxiv. 7.

[4] Exod. xv. 20 f. The word נביאה and the passage, Num. xii. 1 ff., render it indubitable that this belongs to E. The absence of the name Miriam from ii. 1 ff. (Jül., p. 124) is no proof to the contrary. The name of Moses also is not mentioned there.

[5] Exod. xv. 1-18, to which *v.* 19 also belongs.

older form, which perhaps came down from the very days of Moses, is here transformed into an artistically membered psalm for the use of the people in Canaan. Probably it is from an ancient song-book.[1]

From the Red Sea the people journey into the wilderness of Shur and come to Marah. The bitter water is made sweet by the branch of a tree which Moses places in the spring. But Moses here gives to the people 'a statute and ordinance,' *i.e.* settles its disputes.[2] On their forward journey they again contend with Moses about water, in a locality which E does not clearly define. Yahvé orders Moses to go up the mountain with some of the elders of Israel and smite the rock with his rod, and water shall come out.[3]

The Bedouin tribe of the Amalekites attack Israel. A battle is fought at Rephidim. Joshua and the chosen men of Israel fight, whilst Moses, supported by Aaron and Hur, holds up the rod of God which brings victory to Israel.[4]

2. The defeat of the Amalekites is doubtless conceived of as happening near Sinai, the Mount of God.[5] The fight may have been for the oasis near Sinai. Moses purposed making a somewhat long stay here with the people. Israel will thus be able to camp unhindered near the ancient sacred mountain. Great events, ever to be remembered by the people, are to happen here. Moses ascends the mountain to God. The command comes to him that the people are to hold themselves in readiness on

[1] *Cf.* Dillmann, *ExLev.*, pp. 154, 160. On *v.* 17, *cf.* Wellh. *Prol.*[2] p. 23, note (Eng. Trans. p. 22), but see also p. 374, note, and Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 233. It is also quite possible that J's report of the song is from this source.

[2] Exod. xv. 22-25 (Dillmann and Kuenen E, against Jül.). The next verse, in which the judicial activity of Moses is regarded as legislative activity, is an addition due to R^d.

[3] Exod. xvii. 3-6, but mingled in 5 f. with portions from J. The mention of the staff and the elders proves that it belongs to E, against Vatke. For בחרב, *v.* 6, which Jül. and Vatke take to be a gloss, read בהר. Chap. xvi. should follow Num. x.

[4] Exod. xvii. 8-16, according to a special source (*v.* 14), of obvious antiquity, probably used here by E.

[5] Jethro's visit, chap. xviii., like chap. xvi., belongs to a later time, as is clear from *vv.* 16, 20.

the third day. In point of fact, on that day thunder and lightning proclaim God's descent on the mountain. Moses leads the people out of the camp to meet God at the foot of the mountain.[1]

God speaks the Ten Words to the people from the mountain. The people are affrighted by the thunders that accompany the voice of God, and beg that Moses alone may speak with God, and then declare His will to them. Accordingly God speaks to Moses, revealing to him the other statutes and ordinances which the people are to keep.[2] They form a somewhat motley collection of precepts for the civic life of Israel, of the nature of civil and religious law. And along with them there are brief directions concerning the sacrifices and festivals. There is no sufficient ground for denying that E wrote this so-called Book of the Covenant, as Wellhausen, following Stähelin, does.[3]

After receiving the divine law Moses returns to communicate to the people what God has said. They promise to observe all His commandments. Moses writes them out, and then builds an altar at the foot of the mountain, and causes a covenant-sacrifice to be offered by the young men of Israel. Next he reads aloud to the people the *Book of the Covenant* which he has written, and pledges them to the law of the Covenant.[4] Hereupon God calls him again to come up the mountain, that He may hand over to him the tables of stone on which the commandments are written. Moses goes up again with his minister Joshua. He leaves the

[1] Exod. xix. 2*b*, 3*a*, 10, 13-17, 19.

[2] Exod. xx. 1-10, 12-17, but with many later additions by R^{d}, especially in the first half. *Vv.* 18-26 (the transposition of *v.* 18 f., so as to bring it before *v.* 1, [Jül. Kuenen] is not necessary). Chap. xxi., xxii., xxiii., 1-7, 20-22.

[3] Wellh. xxi. p. 556 f. According to him chap. xxi.-xxiii., together with xix. 20-25, xx. 23-26, xxiv. 3-8, belong to J. But we cannot help being surprised at his basing this solely on considerations, some of them very far-fetched, drawn from statements as to facts. The language used speaks decisively for E; *cf.* אלהים, אמה, etc. Against Wellh. see Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 219 f.; Jül., p. 305 ff.; Kuen. *Ond.*^{2} p. 149 f.; Vatke, *Einl.*, p. 340 f.

[4] Exod. xxiv. 3-8. Wellhausen concludes that the people only bind themselves to the ordinances promulgated by Moses (xxi. p. 556). This is clearly disproved by the language employed: 'All the words which Yahvé hath spoken will we do,' *vv.* 3, 7.

people[1] in charge of Aaron and Hur. He remains there forty days and nights to receive the tables of stone,[2] written with the finger of God.[3]

As they return Joshua hears a loud noise in the camp and thinks it is a shout of war. Moses hears better and declares that it is not a war-cry but an antiphonal song. Drawing nigh to the camp he sees the people who had been intrusted to the care of Aaron and Hur dancing round a golden calf and indulging in unbridled licence. In hot anger he breaks the tables of stone in pieces, grinds the image to powder and strews it in the spring from which the people must drink. Helped by the Levites, who range themselves on his side and Yahvé's and slay a number of the people, he restores order. Hence the priesthood of Yahvé is transferred to the tribe of Levi.[4] The apostasy of the people is punished by their being ordered to leave Horeb. Their sin precludes any longer abode in God's dwelling-place. But an angel is to be their guide.[5] Their ornaments, which they had worn since they came from Horeb,[6] they now take off. Moses employs them in making the Tabernacle (probably the ark too[7]), which he pitches without the camp. Joshua, the minister of Moses, is intrusted with the care of the tent.[8]

The camping-grounds on Horeb are the district where Moses formerly dwelt when he was Jethro's shepherd. His wife's relatives pitch their tents here, southwards and eastwards, towards the gulf. According to our author Moses had left her

[1] This, not 'the elders,' is the true reading in *v.* 14. R introduced the present reading to make *v.* 14 correspond with 2 and 10.

[2] *Cf.* the separation of the Ten Words in Vatke, p. 338. It may fairly be believed that the contents of the two tables were as Vatke represents. But the source from which E (and J) drew probably contained rather more matter.

[3] Exod. xxiv. 12-14, 18*b*. ; xxxi. 18*b*.

[4] Exod. xxxii. 15-20 (Kuenen and Dillmann stop at 19*aa*, but it is questionable whether the remainder of 19 and 20 should be separated from the preceding. The mention of the tables, *v.* 15 f., is only intended to prepare the way for the recital of their subsequent fate), 25-29.

[5] Exod. xxxiii. 1-3*a*, but with additions by R[d].

[6] See Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 345, as to the explanation of xxxiii. 6.

[7] This must be supplied between *vv.* 6 and 7. Wellh. xxi. p. 562 f.; Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 345.

[8] Exod. xxxiii. 5-11.

and their children here at home. Jethro, therefore, hearing what has happened in Egypt and on Horeb, hastens to visit Moses, bringing Zipporah and the children.[1] Moses gives Jethro fuller details of what Yahvé has done for Israel, and Jethro blesses Israel's God as the highest among all gods, and offers sacrifices to Him. Aaron and the elders of Israel take part in the meal. On the morrow Jethro sees how Moses alone, without helpers, judges the people. He counsels Moses to continue acting as mediator between the people and God, thus making known to them the divine statutes and directions, but to take to his help competent men from amongst the people, making them heads over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens, and leaving the easier causes to their decision. Moses follows Jethro's advice and arranges thus the judicial procedure of his people 'for all seasons,' and Israel then, in obedience to the divine command, leaves the mountain of God, and travels onwards three days. The ark of the covenant leads the way[2] and points out the camping-places. When it sets forwards Moses cries, 'Rise up, O Yahvé, and let thine enemies be scattered . . . ,' and when it rests, 'Return, O Yahvé, unto the myriads of the thousands of Israel.'[3] Both sayings are undoubtedly ancient, handed down continuously in the tradition of the heroic age, and possibly retained in use in later days when the ark was carried in procession.[4]

On the march, as a punishment for the discontented murmuring of the people, fire breaks out in the uttermost part of the camp, and is only stayed at the intercession of Moses. From this the place is called Taberah.[5] The miraculous feeding with manna also, which our source, like J, relates in detail, soon becomes unsatisfactory to the people. They long for flesh. Yahvé is angry

[1] This is probably the right place for the narrative which R places *before* the occurrences at Sinai, Exod. xviii. 1*a*, 2*a* (2*b* is a harmonistic interpolation), 3-27, but in *vv.* 8-10, mixed with small portions from J.

[2] The words 'three days' journey' are probably a gloss (Wellh., Kuen. *Onl.*[2] p. 322).

[3] Num. x. 33-36.

[4] Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 31; Delitzsch in *ZkWL.* (1882), p. 235; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 53; and especially Kautzsch, *ZAW.* vi. p. 19.

[5] Num. xi. 1-3 (Kuen., Dillm. E).

and sends a wind which brings great multitudes of quails from the sea. But whilst the quails are in the mouths of the people a great plague smites them. The place is named Kibroth-Hattaavah.[1]

Because of a Cushite woman whom Moses has married, either during the lifetime of Zipporah, or, more probably, after her death, Miriam and Aaron rise against him.[2] Seeing that God has spoken with them also and not with Moses only, they claim an equal prophetic position. All three are to assemble at the Tabernacle before the camp. Miriam becomes leprous, but is healed at the prayer of Moses.[3]

When they reach the south-east frontier of Canaan, Moses despatches from Kadesh twelve spies, Caleb amongst the number, to the promised land. Joshua remains with Moses. They are to explore the land and bring back some of its fruits. The spies get as far as the Cluster Brook, not far from Hebron, whence they bring a cluster of grapes as well as other fruits. They show the fruits of the land to their people. . . . Caleb calms the dispirited people. His comrades faint-heartedly dissuade them from going up, because giants live there.[4] The people listen to their persuasions and Yahvé's punishment consequently follows.[5] . . . Israel now repents and would fain press on into Canaan. When Moses dissuades them they attempt it on their own account. But the Amorites, who inhabit the mountain-range, come down and drive Israel back to Hormah.[6]

Our source maintains an almost total silence concerning that long sojourn in the desert which now began anew. Only two

[1] Num. xi. 1-9 is a remnant of this narrative. It is continued in the words ויחר אף יי מאד, *v.* 10 (*cf. vv.* 1, 33, also Wellh. xxi. p. 569), and in *vv.* 30-34.

[2] See Dillm., p. 64, on *v.* 16, against Wellh., p. 569.

[3] Num. xii. 1-15. Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 224, attributes the chapter to E,[2] *v.* 1 being probably his chief reason.

[4] Num. xiii. 20, 23 f., 26*bβ*, 30 f, 32*c*, 33. *V.* 30 f. = E (with Dillmann against Meyer), for otherwise there would be a repetition in xiv. 8 f.

[5] The account of this has been displaced by J.

[6] Num. xiv. 39-45. The main narratives is from E (Meyer, *ZA W.* i. p. 153). In the text we have given the better reading, האמרי, from Deut. i. 44. In *vv.* 43, 45, it displaces E's original reading.

occurrences are localised in it, the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram, and the sin of Moses. Those two Reubenites rise up against the leadership of Moses (and Aaron?) As members of the first tribe they claim equal privileges with the tribe of Levi. Moses announces that God will be the Judge. The rebels are swallowed up by the earth.[1] The place where this happens is not stated, but the proceedings at the Waters of Strife are next mentioned, and this clearly fixes the scene in the district of Kadesh, where Israel therefore, according to this source also,[2] must have stayed a somewhat long, or even a really long, time. The text as it now stands does not give a clear view of the course of events. The only certain fact is that a murmuring of the people for water led Moses and Aaron into sin.[3]

3. When the time of waiting has expired Moses sends messengers from Kadesh to the king of Edom to request a free passage through his territory. Edom refuses, and Israel is thus necessitated to make a wide circuit in order to avoid his land. On the journey the people become dispirited through lack of food and water. God punishes them with fiery serpents. Moses sets up a serpent of brass, by means of which those who had been bitten are healed. The heathenish serpent-worship is introduced into the service of the living God.[4]

Some of the camping-places of Israel, after they had made the circuit of Edom, are now adduced, from an old list of stations which Deuteronomy also makes use of; the Wady of the Upper Zered and the south bank of the (Upper) Arnon.[5] Israel consequently now stands on the south-east boundary of the Amorite country, over against Moab. Our author quotes an old book of

[1] Num. xvi. 1*b*, 2*aa*, 12-14, 15b, 25f, 27*b*-31 (34?). The main narrative seems to be due to E (Kuen.). Dillmann thinks he also finds traces of one from J.

[2] Even if xx. 1*aβb*, as we hold, belongs to J. *Cf.* Deut. i. 46, Judges xi. 17, passages which probably go back to E.

[3] Num. xx. 3-5, 7-11, 13. But the many correspondences with P may give rise to doubt as to whether this belongs to E.

[4] Num. xx. 14-21 (Meyer, Kuen., Dillm., against Wellh.); xxi. 4*aβb*, 5-9. *Cf.* Baudissin, *Stud.* i. p. 289; Reuss, *Gesch. d.A T.*, p. 166; Dillm. *NuDtJo.* p. 120.

[5] Num. xxi. 12 f. *Cf.* Deut. x. 6 f.; Meyer, p. 119; Dillm., p. 121.

songs which dates from the age of the heroic struggles, 'the Book of the Wars of Yahvé;' which sang this song concerning the campaign now undertaken against the Amorites:—

'The Wāhēb in Suphah [we passed through] and the wadies of the Arnon,
And the slope of the valleys that inclineth toward the dwelling of Ar, and leaneth upon the border of Moab.'[1]

North of the Arnon, Israel resumes its march on the edge of the desert to Beer, a well-station, of which the people used to sing in later times in these antique strophes:—

'Spring up, O Well! Sing ye unto it!
To the well which princes digged—which the nobles of the people delved,
With the sceptre, with their staves.'[2]

And now E makes use once more, by anticipation, of the above-mentioned ancient list of stations. From the wilderness (on the border of which the well lay) they journey to Mattanah, thence to the Brook of God, thence to Bamoth, thence to the valley in the field of Moab on the top of Pisgah. Pisgah is probably the Nebo of the Priestly Writing; this brings Israel to the north end of the Dead Sea, over against the mouth of the Jordan.[3]

But Israel has previously sent messengers from the Arnon[4] to Sihon, king of the Amorites, with a like request to that they had previously addressed to Edom. Sihon, however, marches against Israel and they join battle at Jahaz. Israel vanquishes him and conquers his land, from the Arnon to the Jabbok on the north, and on the east up to Jazer, which marks the Ammonite boundary.[5] Israel takes possession of the cities of the Amorites and dwells in (occupies) Heshbon and her daughter-towns. This Heshbon was at first a Moabite city, but Sihon in a recent campaign against Moab had taken it from the former king of Moab. E inserts here

[1] Num. xxi. 14 f. [2] Num. xxi. 16-18*a*.

[3] Num. xxi. 18*b*-20. For the relation of these verses to the preceding and the following, *cf.* Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 152.

[4] Deut. ii. 26 names the place more definitely, Midbar Kedemoth. The scene lies earlier than 18*b*.

[5] See Dillmann on Num. xxi. 24.

an ancient poem[1] which refers to this overthrow of Moab, and at the same time (at the opening and the close) to Israel's victory over Sihon:—

'Come [even] to Heshbon—let the city of Sihon be built and established.
For fire went out from Heshbon—a flame from the city of Sihon;
It devoured the city of Moab—the lords of the high-places of Arnon.
Woe to thee, Moab! Thou art undone, O people of Chemosh!
He gave his sons as fugitives—his daughters as captives to Sihon, king of the Amorites. . . .
We shot at them; Heshbon perished unto Dibon—we set fire even as far as Nophah, as far as Medebah.'[2]

The Moabite king, Balak, made anxious by Israel's victory over the Amorites, is here also represented as sending for the seer Balaam, and that from Pethor on the Euphrates, to check Israel's advance. He refuses at first to come, but consents when God gives him permission. Balak goes to meet him at the border of his territory, at 'Ir ('Ar) Moab on the Arnon. From there he takes him to the district occupied by Israel north of the Arnon, to Bamoth Baal. Instead of cursing, Balaam blesses Israel. This is repeated when Balak changes the standpoint, taking him to the Field of the Watchmen.[3]

It does not come to a war with Moab. But Israel attaches itself (in Shittim ?) to the service of Baal-Peor, who is worshipped in that region. Moses punishes the guilty, having them massacred.[4]

[1] Ed. Meyer, *ZA W.* i. 128 f., and *ZA W.* v. 36 ff., makes the poem refer to the period immediately prior to our author, *i.e.* to the wars of Mesha. Against this view of its age see Kuen. *Theol. Tijdschr.* xviii. p. 479 ff., and *Ond.*[2] p. 230; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 129, and the discussion on p. 91 above. See also Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 230, as to the idea that *v.* 26 was a mere gloss, there having really been no Amorite kingdom. If the author did not know the name of the former king of Moab and was unwilling to introduce one of his own invention, it is not clear how he was to express himself otherwise than by מלך מואב הראשון, unless he resorted to a lengthy circumlocution (*cf.* Meyer, *ZA W.* v. p. 41).

[2] Num. xxi. 27-30. In *v.* 27 the speech passes over from Israel to the Amorites; *v.* 28 f. relate Sihon's victory over Moab; *v.* 30, Israel's victory over Sihon; *vv.* 31-35 is probably a later addition.

[3] Num. xxii. 2, 3*b*, 5-17 (except trifling points in *vv.* 5 and 7), 19, 21*b*, 35*b*, 36-38, 40; xxiii. 1-22, 24 f. (against Wellhausen, *cf.* שרי מאב, אלהים, *v.* 17, and קרה, as in Exod. iii. 18, v. 3); *vv.* 23 and 26 ff. were added by R[d].

[4] Num. xxv. 3, 5. But see Josh. xxiv. 9, and on it Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 585.

The tribes of Gad and Reuben ask for the pasture-land on the east of the Jordan. They wish to leave here their wives, children, and cattle, but declare their readiness to help the people in conquering the west before settling down permanently in their own abode. Gad obtains eight towns, Reuben six, to build or rebuild, as the case may be, in the southern part of the land east of the Jordan.[1] The Manassite clans, Machir and Jair, afterwards conquer Gilead, the northern part of the east country. A clan of the name of Nobah also conquers the district of Kenath,[2] which has perhaps been discovered in the ruins called Kanawat, on the slope of the Hauran range.[3]

The extensive interpolation occasioned by the insertion of Deuteronomy has broken the connection in E, as in the rest. It is not till Deut. xxxi. that the thread is resumed. Yahvé announces to Moses that he is to die, and appoints Joshua to be his successor.[4] In the original E there next came a song of Moses[5] and his Blessing,[6] taken from an older source. (Moses dies): henceforth there arises no prophet in Israel who had seen God face to face.[7]

§ 22.—*The Narrative-Material of P.*

The sons of Israel, having gone into Egypt, multiply there exceedingly. The Egyptians consequently embitter their lives with severe forced labour.[8] They groan, and their cry reaches to

[1] Of Num. xxxii., a chapter which in any case has undergone considerable revision, *v.* 16 f., 24, 34-38, and probably some details in 1 ff., belong here.

[2] Num. xxxii. 39, 41 f., a statement which E has inserted here by anticipation. It gave rise to the view in (? P and) R that half the tribe of Manasseh held part of the land east of the Jordan as early as the Mosaic period.

[3] Kenath need not be supposed farther south (Bäd.[2] p. 313 (Eng. Ed. p. 415).

[4] Deut. xxxi. 14-23 (?). *Cf.* Kuen. *Ond.*[2] pp. 124, 152, 250. He claims the section for JE. Dillmann ascribes 16-22 to J.

[5] This is indicated by Deut. xxxii. 44, a verse which presupposes a Song of Moses. The Song, Deut. xxxii. 1-43, which is now attributed to Moses (against Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 394) cannot have come from either E or J, but is of later date. R[d] found it extant and substituted it for E's more ancient Song of Moses. See also Stade, *ZA W.* v. 297 ff. [6] Deut. xxxiii. 1-29 (*v.* 1 added by E).

[7] Deut. xxxiv. 10.

[8] Exod. i. 1-5, 7 (*aβ* probably an addition by R), 13, 14 (in part).

God: He remembers His covenant with their fathers.[1] He tells Moses how He appeared unto their fathers as El Shaddai but did not reveal unto them His name Yahvé. He will bring Israel out of Egypt.[2] He has made Moses to be god over Pharaoh, and Aaron, his brother, is to be his prophet. Moses is to give orders to Aaron, who will thereupon work the miracles with his rod. But Yahvé will harden Pharaoh's heart so that he will not let the sons of Israel go. Moses is at that time eighty years old, Aaron eighty-three. At the bidding of Moses, Aaron performs the first miracle (the turning the rod into a serpent). The Egyptian magicians do likewise.[3] In the same manner the second sign (the changing all the water in Egypt into blood), and the third (the frogs) are performed.[4] At the fourth sign (lice) the magicians' skill fails and they themselves are smitten with the fifth (boils).[5]

Before narrating the Exodus P introduces the institution of the Passover, after which he briefly sketches the march out of Egypt. They journey from Raamses to Succoth, six hundred thousand men strong, after dwelling in Egypt four hundred and thirty years.[6] The dedication of the firstborn is also commanded immediately after their setting out.[7]

From Succoth they journey to Etham, where God bids them turn to Pi-hahiroth on the Red Sea. Thither Pharaoh pursues them. Israel cries to the Lord. Moses stretches out his hand over the sea, and the waters are divided . . . the Egyptians pursue the Israelites into the midst of the sea. . . . Moses again stretches out his hand, and the sea returns,[8] and covers the Egyptians. They reach Elim, where they find twelve springs and seventy palm-trees.[9]

[1] Exod. ii. 23*aβ*-25. [2] Exod. vi. 2-30 (Kuen. 6-8, 13-30 = R).

[3] Exod. vii. 1-13. [4] Exod. vii. 19, 20*aa*, 22, 23 (? see above); viii. 1-3.

[5] Exod. viii. 11*aβb*-15; ix. 8-12. xi. 9 f. probably belongs to this, forming its conclusion; but see Jül., p. 86.

[6] Exod. xii. 1-20, 28, 37 partly (see above), 40 f., 43-51. The order is here disturbed by R. Dillmann puts *vv.* 14-20 after 49, and *v.* 40 f. after 50, and the execution of the judgment after *v.* 28. Jül. attributes xii. 1-14 to P and 15-20 to P^2 (but *cf.* בתים, *v.* 7). [7] Exod. xiii. 1, 2 (against Jül.).

[8] Exod. xiii. 20; xiv. 1-4 (Wellh. *v.* 3 f. = E), 8, 9*aβb*, 10*bβ*, 15, 17, 18, 21*aab*, 22*b*, 23, 26, 28*a*. *V.* 29 is probably a gloss. [9] Exod. xv. 27.

Departing thence they come to the desert of Sin, between Elim and Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the second month after the Exodus. The whole congregation murmur against Moses and Aaron for bread and flesh. The glory of the Lord appears in the cloud, and Yahvé promises the people flesh in the evening and bread in the morning. The people obtain quails and manna.[1] We have already shown that J originally put this event after the occurrences at Sinai: in P it is connected with a locality which they came to before reaching Sinai.

Rephidim is the next encampment.[2] R has used J and E in his account of what happened here. Leaving here, the people reach the desert of Sinai (in the third month after the Exodus).[3] The events at Sinai also are, in the first instance, reported quite on the lines of the older sources. There can hardly be any doubt that P, like the rest, contained the Decalogue. The same assertion could scarcely be made concerning the Book of the Covenant. The probabilities rather are that instead of the latter, P had the description of the Tabernacle and the detailed priestly legislation. So far as the connection of our source can now be made out, it would appear that P represented Moses as being summoned to ascend the mountain on the seventh day after the arrival at Sinai[4] to receive the description of the Tabernacle,[5] the Decalogue not having been promulgated as yet.

Now follows this description itself, and in immediate connection with it the account of the construction of the Tabernacle.[6] Before Moses is dismissed from the mountain to carry out the work, he receives the two tables of the testimony.[7] Between the revelation

[1] Exod. xvi. 1-3, 9-13, 14 f. (at least in part), 16*b*-18*a*, 22-26, 31-35*a*. Wellh. *c.* 14 f. = E. Jül. ascribes the whole to P except 4 f., 28, 30, 32-34, which he assigns to R^d. Kuenen assigns 22-27 also to R.

[2] Exod. xvii. 1*aba*.

[3] Exod. xix. 2*a*. *V.* 1, with its note of time, seems to be an addition (P^2?).

[4] Unless, as is quite probable (*cf.* Nadab and Abihu), fragments of P are preserved in xxiv. 1-3, 9-11. Neither context, form, nor contents allow of the verses being assigned to any of the other sources (Dillm. J, Kuen. E, see Wellh. xxi. p. 557, and again p. 558; also Jül., p. 315).

[5] Exod. xxiv. 15*b*-18*a* comes immediately after xix. 2*a* (Kuen. 18*a* = E).

[6] Exod. xxv. 1-xxxi. 17; xxxv. 1-xl. 38. [7] Exod. xxxi. 18*a*.

and the construction of the Tabernacle, P may possibly have inserted a statement about the golden calf; yet the words in question may be a gloss.[1] Hence it is more likely that P omitted a story so little to Aaron's credit, and thought of Moses as descending the mountain with no further cause of trouble.[2]

P's narrative is now considerably interrupted by the insertion of that great body of laws which we have discussed more closely elsewhere. They are supposed to be given to Moses from the Tabernacle immediately after its erection. They occupy the entire book of Leviticus and a considerable part of Numbers. It is not till Num. x. 11 that the long-lost thread of the narrative is provisionally taken up again. In the second month of the second year, that is to say, after about a year's abode at Sinai, the cloud rises above the habitation of the Testimony; the sons of Israel leave the wilderness of Sinai and travel to the wilderness of Paran.[3] Kibroth-Hattaavah is passed *en route*; thence the people move on towards Haseroth,[4] and come thus to the wilderness of Paran.[5]

This wilderness stretches in the north as far as the Negeb of Judah. Accordingly, spies are sent hence to Canaan. They are twelve tribal chiefs, and their names are given by P. From the desert of Sin (at the northern extremity of Paran) they penetrate to Rehob in the far north of Canaan. At the end of forty days they return to Moses, Aaron, and the congregation, with the information that the land devours its inhabitants.[6] The people begin to murmur against Moses and Aaron. Joshua and Caleb, who were of the number of the spies, seek to encourage them. But Yahvé sentences the sons of Israel from twenty years old and upward to die in the wilderness; they are to wander there forty

[1] Part of Exod. xxxii. 15, to which *v.* 35 should probably be added, may belong to this.

[2] He probably had here the account of the shining face of Moses, Exod. xxxiv. 29-32 (33-35). So Wellh., p. 566, Dillm., p. 332 (Kuen. = R).

[3] Num. x. 11 f. *Vv.* 13-28 are not improbably a later addition to P.

[4] Num. xi. 35. Possibly P contained a history of the occurrences at Kibroth-Hattaavah. *Cf.* the traces in xi. 24*a* and in *vv.* 18-22.

[5] Num. xii. 16. [6] Num. xiii. 1-17*a*, 21, 25, 26*aba*, 32*ab*.

years, according to the forty days taken up by the spies. None but Joshua and Caleb shall see the land.[1]

The rebellion of Korah and his company takes place at some time during the thirty-eight years' wandering. It is probable that two narratives of it from P have been preserved to us. At all events, Korah had originally nothing in common with the Reubenites, Dathan and Abiram, save a mutinous disposition. According to one of the narratives he is an apostate Levite (Wellh. Judahite ?), and makes common cause with two hundred and fifty heads of the people, who do not belong to the tribe of Levi, against Moses and Aaron, especially against the Levitical priesthood. They assert the holiness of the entire congregation, and protest, in the name of the lay tribes, against the priestly prerogatives of Levi. The glory of the Lord, before the Tabernacle, decides against them. Yahvé is about to destroy the entire people, but allows himself to be prevailed on to cause the earth to swallow up Korah and his men with their households.[2] A second, later narrative in P represents Korah as the head of a conspiracy formed by two hundred and fifty Levites like-minded with himself. Having been reduced to an inferior position they would now attack the Aaronic priesthood. They are consumed, near the Tabernacle, by a fire which comes forth from Yahvé.[3]

To the former of these narratives, the principal one in P, is attached the account of the blossoming of Aaron's rod. When the people murmur because of the destruction of the rebels, they are thus shown that the priesthood belongs to the tribe of Levi as against the lay tribes (not to Aaron as against the other Levites).[4]

[1] Num. xiv. 1*a*, 2, 5-7, 10 (with Dillmann, Kuenen makes 1*a*, 2*a*, 3, 5-7, 10, 26-38 = P), 26-29 (Kuenen says edited by R), 34-39.

[2] This is the account given by P^1 in Num. xvi. 2-7*a*, 15*a* (18), 19-23, parts of 24, 26, 27 (the reading, למשכן יהוה, ., Dillm., is not necessary; P^1 and E both mention the same kind of death and are intermingled here), 32-34.

[3] Thus P^2 in Num. xvi. 1*a*, 7*b*, 8-11, 16, 17 (18), 35; xvii. 1-5. On the whole chapter *cf.* Wellh. xxi. p. 572 ff.; Kuen. *Th. Tijd.* xii. p. 139 ff.; Dillm., *NuDtJo*, p. 87 ff.; also Kittel, *ThStW.* ii. pp. 39, 162-165. *Cf.* further Kautzsch, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.* ii. 39, p. 36 ff.

[4] Num. xvii. 6-28. *Cf.* my discussion of the passage in *ThStW.* ii. p. 162 f.

No doubt the two laws that follow, relating to the position of the priests and Levites and the uncleanness caused by dead bodies,[1] also owe their present position in P, if not their origin, to their connection with the story of Korah.

The events at Kadesh, in the desert of Sin, also belong in P to the thirty-eight years. And Israel has its principal settlement in this region (Paran) according to P also. The people murmur for water, and this leads Moses and Aaron to sin in some way which, here too, is no longer clear. On this account they also are not to see the promised land.[2]

After the departure from Kadesh, Israel comes to Mount Hor, in the fortieth year of the Exodus.[3] This brings them to the border of Edom. The border of Edom mentioned here[4] must be the southern one. Aaron dies here.[5] The stations of Oboth and Iye-abarim are next mentioned, Salmonah and Punon[6] having been omitted (probably by accident). They have thus reached the eastern boundary of Moab, and consequently, as in E, have gone round the south of Edom and the east of Moab.[7] For P, as for the other sources, Balaam's name is connected with these regions, though he plays here another part. The women of Midian[8] lead the Israelite men into fornication; a plague from Yahvé carries off twenty-four thousand Israelites, till Phinehas by his vigorous interposition brings it to an end.[9] According to P this sin is due to Balaam, who counselled Midian to effect Israel's destruction by the wrath of God in this fashion.[10] The result is that Israel undertakes a war of extermination against Midian.[11] The

[1] Num. xviii., xix. [2] Num. xx. 1*aa*, 2, 6, 12; *cf. v.* 24.

[3] Num. xxxiii. 38; the number missing in chap. xx. is to be supplied from this passage.

[4] At all events, the בקצה of *v.* 23 precludes our looking for Hor *in* Edom. See Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 116. [5] Num. xx. 22-29.

[6] *Cf.* Num. xxxiii. 41, 42. [7] Num. xxi. 4*aa*, 10, 11.

[8] On this account it is possible to believe that there are remnants of P in Num. xxii. 4, 7: see above.

[9] Num. xxv. 6-19. Kuenen holds *vv.* 16-18, and Dillmann *vv.* 10-13, to be a later addition in P. [10] Num. xxxi. 8, 16, which is to be supplied here.

[11] Num. xxxi. The present text is a fairly late addition to P, occasioned probably by the statements which originally belonged to Num. xxv. 6 ff.

numbering of Israel at the close of the journey through the desert, a few laws,[1] and, finally, the announcement of the death of Moses, and the consecration of Joshua as his successor, are inserted in P between the two narratives last mentioned. Moses is to die on Mount Abarim after viewing the land.[2]

Reuben and Gad (and half Manasseh?) beg for and obtain districts in the east. Afterwards the Manassite clan of Machir joins them.[3]

The Book of Numbers ends with the list of stations,[4] in which a final glance is cast over the march through the desert, the command to exterminate the inhabitants of the land, the determination of its boundaries, and a few supplementary ordinances.[5]

It is not till the end of Deuteronomy that our source for a brief space again emerges to view. For reasons that can easily be understood R has placed here, instead of in their original position, the few notices it contains of the events that happened prior to the actual conquest of the land. Moses is commanded to go up Mount Abarim, Mount Nebo in the land of Moab, over against Jericho, to see the land of Canaan, and then die.[6] He does so (and dies), being a hundred and twenty years old. Joshua succeeds him.[7]

After the exposition we have given in § 14, No. 2, it is unnecessary to characterise in detail the course pursued by the editor (R^h) in this part of the Pentateuch. On the whole he takes the same line here as in Genesis. The only distinction is that in

[1] The numbering in Num. xxvi., the laws in xxvii. 1-11, xxviii. xxx. 1. On Num. xxx. 2 ff., see Dillm., p. 185. [2] Num. xxvii. 12-23.

[3] Num. xxxiv. 14 f. and Josh. xiii. 15 ff. suffice to show that at least parts of Num. xxxii. belong to P. *Cf.* Kuen. *Ond.*[2] p. 100 f., Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 193. *Vv.* 2, 4, 18-22, 28-32, 40 probably come from P. It is uncertain whether 'half Manasseh' in *v.* 33 is also from P, or is due to R; the latter, however, is more probable.

[4] Num. xxxiii. 1-49. P gives this list, which he probably drew from older writings. In its present form it bears many marks of the hand of R (abbreviating and in some places enlarging or altering the sense, see below § 23, No. 6). For the rest see Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 202; Kayser, *Vorexil. Buch.*, p. 97 ff.; Wellh. xxii. p. 453; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] pp. 101, 325.

[5] Num. xxxiii. 51, 54; xxxiv.-xxxvi. [6] Deut. xxxii. 48-52.

[7] Deut. xxxiv. 1*aα*, 7*a*, 8 f. Dillmann adds *v.* 5, but I prefer assigning this to J.

the other books R^d has, in some places, made far more alterations than in Genesis. Consequently R^h was in many respects anticipated. Otherwise his main task continues the same as in Genesis, the harmonious grouping of all his material on the lines furnished by P. The task is more difficult than in Genesis, because the material is more abundant and varied. It is not his fault that he has accomplished his purpose less successfully here than there.

II. THE HISTORICAL SUBSTANCE OF THE STORY OF MOSES.

§ 23. *The Statements of the Old Testament.*

1. We are now to bring together again the threads of the texture presented by our extant tradition which we have hitherto been taking asunder. The result is a picture which, with manifold diversity of detail, exhibits nevertheless a remarkable harmony in almost all essential points, besides a considerable number of obviously trustworthy features. The following is a brief sketch of the chief features of the picture which our tradition gives of that epoch in Hebrew history.

Israel, with the tribe of Joseph at its head, forsakes its ancient settlements in the neighbourhood of its brother-tribe Edom, and wanders into Egypt. There the people dwell, for an undefined length of time,[1] in the land of Goshen. They retain their own language, their nomadic customs, and, at all events partially, their ancestral religion.[2] The tenacity with which they cling to their national and religious peculiarities, coupled with the dread lest they should make common cause[3] with the enemies of Egypt,

[1] P, at Exod. xii. 40 f., makes it four hundred and thirty years; Gen. xv. 3 (in round numbers) four hundred; other passages (Exod. vi. 16 ff., Num. xxvi. 29 ff., Ruth iv. 18 ff., 1 Chron. ii. 18 ff., vii. 22 ff., etc.) much less. The Jews, according to Sam., LXX., and Josephus, say two hundred and fifteen years, as do many Fathers of the Church and moderns. *Cf.* Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 120 f.

[2] *Cf.* the phrase, 'the God of thy fathers,' Exod. iii. 6, xv. 2, xviii. 4. At least in the family from which Moses sprang the ancient God must therefore have been worshipped, though not under the name Yahvé (see below). But on the other hand, for the rest (the larger part?) of the people, see Josh. xxiv. 14 ff., Ez. xvi. 8, xx. 5 ff., 23 ff. (Amos v. 25 f.?)

[3] Exod. i. 9 f.

induces the Egyptians to treat with ever-increasing harshness the strangers whom they formerly left unmolested. Especially are they compelled to do severe forced labour. Since they would not voluntarily become incorporated with the Egyptians they should be deprived of their nationality by force and by sustained pressure.[1] Israel smarts under a bondage to which the native Egyptians have grown accustomed through long usage, but which free shepherds deem disgraceful.[2] Yet they do not summon up strength and resolution to shake off the yoke. Then a deliverer arises for Israel in the person of Moses. Moved by love for his people, he kills an Egyptian, and is consequently under the necessity of fleeing to the wilderness near Sinai. There he becomes son-in-law to one of the Arabian shepherd-princes. In intercourse with this man, who is the priest of his tribe, and, yet more, in the impressive solitude of the Desert of Sinai, which seems to bring God nearer to man, Moses acquires a new knowledge of God. Yahvé, the living God, reveals to him His nature. In Him he perceives the power by which his people may be delivered.

He returns to Egypt and preaches the new God, who at the same time is the God of the fathers of Israel. With this fresh faith in Israel's God, he arouses the courage and self-reliance of the people. Israel is ready to leave Egypt and follow Moses into the wilderness. Moses and his compatriots take advantage of punishments inflicted by God on the Egyptians,[3] and make their escape. His purpose is to lead them first to the wilderness and to the Mount of God, which has long been known as the abode of the Deity, and to himself has become a holy place. There he will make them more closely acquainted with their God.

On the shore of the Red Sea Israel is overtaken by the pursuing Egyptians; the work of Moses, but just born, is threatened with destruction. A suddenly intervening natural occurrence,

[1] See Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 11 ff. (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 4 ff.)

[2] *Cf.* the oft-repeated expression, 'house of bondage.'

[3] The traditions vary with regard to the plagues: see above, § 20 ff. But all agree as to the main fact.

in which Israel ever afterwards saw the delivering hand of its God, enables Israel to pass unscathed through the sea, whilst the foes, with their chariots and horses, pressing after them, are swallowed in the waves.

At Sinai Moses makes known to the rescued people the will of their God. In Yahvé's name he gives them a law, and makes God's covenant with them. Israel has now become Yahvé's possession and people. Moses gives an ark to the people to be the visible pledge of God's presence, the place where He may be adored, the sacred palladium. The Tabernacle is its sheltering tent.

On leaving Sinai, Israel wanders about in the wilderness, pasturing its flocks at large. But it does not lose sight of the wish to win its ancient settlements in the north of the Peninsula. Accordingly the people come to Kadesh, a desert station on the south edge of the Holy Land. An attempt to press northwards is defeated through their own cowardice. Wasted and beaten, they must wait for years ere they can again contemplate a forward march. Thus are their cowardliness and lack of faith in Yahvé punished by their having to live several decades in and around Kadesh.

Power and opportunity for carrying out their intentions do not come till a generation has passed away. A branch of the Amorites, the people which at that time held the greater part of Canaan, has, under its king, Sihon, driven from their homes Israel's relatives, the Hebrew tribes of Moab and Ammon. Ammon loses the district of the Upper Jabbok, Moab that which runs northward from the Arnon as far as the Lower Jabbok. Heshbon becomes the capital of this new Canaanite kingdom. Moses seizes the opportunity, takes part in the conflict, and makes himself master of Sihon's kingdom.[1] He retains that part of the Moabite territory which Sihon had conquered. He leaves to Balak the remainder of his kingdom, which Sihon had also, no doubt, begun to threaten.

[1] On the probable agreement amongst the sources respecting this point, also see below, p. 229 f.

Towards Ammon he seems to have pursued the same line of action.[1]

Moses apportions the conquered district to the tribes of Reuben and Gad. He then dies, without having crossed the Jordan, and leaves his work to be carried out by his minister Joshua.

2. This sketch brings together the main statements which are unanimously made by the sources or in all probability were originally made by them. But it is evident that the historic credibility of the Mosaic story is not conclusively evinced, either by this substantial harmony of the sources or by the impression of trustworthiness which is thus created. For alongside the general agreement of our narratives there are in other points undeniable discrepancies. And, as a rule, we are not in a position to judge of the extent to which statements which agree with an earlier source are made independently or are reproduced by the later writer from that source. Moreover, as we have seen, the dates of our three main sources, E, J, and P, fall some centuries later than the Mosaic period. We must, therefore, seek for other proofs of the credibility of the events recorded in the Mosaic story.

The examination of the documents has shown that in E especially, but also in J, ancient writings, some of them contemporary with the events, were made use of. We must fix our attention on these.

First of all we come across those ancient songs which E especially has woven into his account. It may be assumed that they were the accompaniments of the several supreme moments in the Mosaic history, serving as the hallowed expression of the feelings excited by great events. Afterwards they were written down or passed on from mouth to mouth. They begin with the Song at the Sea,[2] the enthusiastic pæan over Israel's deliverance at the Red Sea, which in one place is put into the lips of Moses, and in another into Miriam's. The structure of the song enables us to distinguish between a shorter, older form, and an enlarged, later

[1] According to Judges xi. On this see below.
[2] Exod. xv. 1-19, 20 f. See above, pp. 92 and 206.

one. If the latter, which is a psalm composed according to the rules of art, received its present shape after the settlement in Canaan, the shorter poem is at all events far older. It bears the stamp of originality, and doubtless would not lose this if, instead of the fragment[1] we now possess, the entire poem in its original shape were preserved. It would be groundless scepticism to maintain that the song is an artificial echo of the later legends concerning the passage through the Red Sea. Such an idea is psychologically incomprehensible, and is absolutely condemned by the exquisite simplicity and grandeur of the poem. Where is there an instance of fiction consciously produced by later generations displaying such strength and purity of inspiration?

If the song is original it is a brief but expressive documentary proof of a tremendous catastrophe having occurred, when Yahvé cast the enemies of Israel into the sea 'with the horse and riders.' That the sea can have been no other than the Red Sea, the enemies none but the Egyptians pursuing Israel, and the time that of the Exodus, is shown, not only by the commentary which accompanies the second form of the song, but also by the corresponding tradition in our Old Testament sources. But if these latter are confirmed, with respect to the central event, the catastrophe, by a document so important as the Song at the Sea, it follows that the historical context in which they set it gains in historical light and importance. Moreover, this is the only event that can be referred to, and no one will seriously think of another.

The fact of our narrators making use of traditions which differ as to the attendant circumstances does not disprove the reality of the Passage through the Sea and the destruction of the Egyptian pursuers. The well-ascertained result as to the event itself cannot be touched even by our inability to disengage from the varying strata of tradition each single incident as it actually occurred and set it in clear light. Wellhausen,[2] following J's account, has attempted to trace the actual course of events. According to him

[1] Exod. xv. 20 f. [2] *Abriss der Gesch. Isr.*, p. 6 (Eng. Ed. p. 3 f.).

the view to which P (and probably[1] E) gave currency, that the pursuing enemies were surprised by the returning waves does not correspond precisely with the facts. Instead of this, as J states, both armies cross the arm of the sea which has been denuded of water by a wind blowing during the night. The battle takes place on the farther shore: the locality is not favourable to the full employment of forces consisting largely of horses and chariots. They are thrown into confusion and begin to retreat, hoping the land-wind will hold out. As they return through the bed of the sea the wind changes, the waves return and cover them.

Compared with the other view this is preferable as giving a perfectly comprehensible picture, the naturalness of which is self-evident. Nor is there any justification for thinking that this is a rationalising of what had at first been a purely miraculous account. True, the description in J brings out clearly the natural instrumentality employed in executing God's sentence, the coming and going of the land-wind. But nothing is further from the writer's mind than the inclination to set aside Yahvé's miraculous intervention *in* the physical occurrence. The wind and the confusion of the enemy come from Yahvé. Obviously J has here the most ancient source to draw from. He narrates the process in which God's miraculous help came, as it, no doubt, really unfolded itself; giving all the details just as the narrator himself had almost experienced them, or, at least, as he must have drawn them from a very early tradition which closely followed the actual occurrence. E and P represent a later stage of the tradition, in which the religious consciousness has kept hold of the essential point, the interposition of Yahvé, but has blurred the historical sense of the details and of the natural basis of the divine act.

The result we have obtained is historically rich in consequences. Not only the Song, but all three main sources have historic ground beneath them. The Passage through the Sea is a historical fact. But this is a link of a chain which implies others, earlier as well

[1] As we now have it, E breaks off at the Passage of the Sea (see § 21), but his account probably resembled P rather than J.

as later. The abode in Egypt, the Exodus thence, the continued journeying in the Desert towards Sinai, are thereby all made certain.

3. It is desirable to pass at once from the beginning of the journey through the Desert and to fix our attention on its close.

Our sources are all at one[1] in speaking of a long-continued abode of Israel in Kadesh. And they are perfectly agreed that when the Israelites at last moved from Kadesh they did not take the direct route to Palestine from south to north, but turned eastwards so as to enter the country west of the Jordan somewhere near the mouth of that river. Each of the three narrators[2] was therefore obliged to ask what arrangements Israel made with the populations settled on its line of march, Edom and Moab (and Ammon). It is expressly stated by E, and at least mentioned by P, that the first of these districts, Edom, was not passed through, but was avoided by taking a wide circuit.[3] According to P, and especially to Judges xi. 17, it must be held that Moab was treated in the same way. E tells us further how Moses sent also to request from Sihon, king of the Amorites, a passage through his land, but did not take the refusal so patiently as in the case of Edom and Moab, being the less inclined to this because Sihon's refusal took the form of preparation for war. A war ensues. Moses is victorious. Sihon's kingdom just taken from his predecessors the Moabites (and Ammonites) falls into Israel's hands.

It is exceedingly remarkable that neither J nor P mentions the fight with Sihon. This consideration alone suffices to render Meyer's and Stade's view plausible.[4] They think that the fight with Sihon was not an original element of the tradition, much less a historical fact, but a mere fiction of E's.

Meyer[5] is mistaken in maintaining that J and P believe Israel

[1] See above, §§ 20-22.

[2] We need not remark in further detail on the account in Deut. i. ff. It does not claim to be an independent narrative, but a free, hortatory version of the narrative matter which it found in E.

[3] See above, p. 220.

[4] See above, pp. 90, 213 f.

[5] *ZAW.* v. p. 47 f. On P, *cf.* above, p. 220; on J the following.

to have made a peaceful march through Edom and Moab. But although he is mistaken on this point, the silence of the two sources as regards Sihon excites a reasonable suspicion. Meyer's theory fails, however, to remove the difficulty, at any rate as far as P is concerned. For whether E introduced Sihon without any support from facts or not, P is considerably more recent than E. In fact, Meyer and Stade scarcely regard him as a historian; he is to them a mere compiler from earlier sources. What inducement, then, could he have for striking out the fight with Sihon, an event which could only enhance Israel's glory? It is evident that the omission of Sihon cannot well be due to P himself. It must be ascribed to R, who found in E the fullest narrative, founded for the most part on authentic documents, and therefore gave it the preference. The same considerations apply to J, if it is admitted that J is later than E and acquainted with that source. And even those who believe J to be the older cannot but admit the weight of the argument drawn from the fragmentary and obviously mutilated condition of this part of J. It is not Sihon only who is left unmentioned. Not a word is said about Israel's relations to Edom, whether the latter country was passed through or avoided. Immediately after Israel's abode in Kadesh the Balaam episode is introduced.[1] J certainly did not write in that abrupt fashion. And although the reason for the mutilation may possibly be found in certain discrepancies between his text and E, there is no ground for concluding from the present state of his text that he did not here relate the fight with Sihon.

I proceed therefore on the assumption that J and P as well as E were acquainted with the fight against Sihon, and that their apparent silence is due to R. This assumption is strongly recommended by the fact that the conquest of the land east of the Jordan cannot be understood apart from the war with the Amorites. Balak's action, and his fears for the remainder of his territory are meaningless if Israel marched peacefully through Moab, as Meyer holds P to have followed J in stating.[2] If Israel came

[1] See above, p. 202.

[2] *ut supra.*

simply as a friend and was welcomed into the land of Moab, what reason had Balak for getting this friend cursed? But if Israel had shown itself to be a considerable military power and was now occupying Moabite territory instead of restoring it to Balak, his fears were well grounded.

Moreover, P and J agree with E as to there having been no war with Moab. But if the territory of Moab was the starting-point of the invasion of Canaan, and if it is incredible that Moab willingly allowed Israel to stay a long time in the Arboth Moab, the only possible conclusion is that P and J assume what E states, viz., that Moab had had to give up a portion of its territory to Sihon not long before, and Israel now took from him this Moabite territory. The same result is reached when we take into account the unanimity of the tradition as to the avoidance of a conflict with Moab and Edom. If a struggle with Sihon is not admitted, the implication is that Israel reached the Jordan without once drawing the sword. This can hardly have been the meaning of the narrative in J and P.

The evidence of the sources is then, as has already been shown,[1] strongly in favour of the idea that the action against Sihon, which is common to all the chief sources, really occurred. The doubts which Meyer and Stade have expressed as to the great antiquity of the Song[2] which E inserted in his narrative have been found by us to be ill-founded. On the contrary we have here to do with an ancient historical document of the highest value, which certifies us that in the Mosaic period the Canaanites (Amorites) under Sihon established themselves also in the land east of the Jordan, and partially expelled Moab and Ammon from their homes.[3] Israel believes itself justified in fighting the intruder, but retains for itself the territory recovered from him. This explains Balak's anxiety for the rest of his land and his proceedings against Israel.

But E's narrative is pronounced untrustworthy on the ground that it contradicts facts. Meyer says that the districts which the

[1] See above, p. 90, also p. 213 f.

[2] Num. xxi. 27-30.

[3] To be supplied according to Judges xi. 12 ff.

narrative and the Song call the kingdom of Sihon were in point of fact purely Moabite. The proofs of this are drawn from the times of Mesha and Isaiah. No one doubts the truth of the assertion so far as those periods are concerned. But what do we know about the extent of the Moabite territory in the days of Moses except from E's accounts?[1] In so far as the sources designate this district 'the territory of the Moabites' they are fully justified, seeing that the country was Moabite both previously and subsequently, and therefore probably bore the name 'Arboth Moab' as a fixed geographical title.[2]

4. If the fight with Sihon is established this casts light both forwards and backwards. We have here to deal with the latter.

The sources are unanimous as to Israel's having dwelt a long time in Kadesh and the neighbourhood before setting out for the field of Moab.[3] Almost every one now[4] thinks that P differs from the other sources in not bringing Israel to Kadesh till the close of the journey through the Desert. I cannot deem this view necessary.[5] But on the supposition of its truth the various accounts do yet agree again significantly in making the Israelites remain a long

[1] Meyer in *ZA W.* i. p. 128.

[2] Nor can I believe Meyer correct in holding (*ZA W.* v. p. 44) that even Judges xi. does not mean that Sihon's kingdom was carved out of Moab and Ammon, but that it was originally Amorite territory. Had this been the case the Ammonite in Judges xi. 13 would have had nothing to go on in claiming the district as his property. His only exaggeration is in putting Ammon instead of Ammon and Moab; Jephthah corrects him, *v.* 15. The only possible meaning of his reasoning is that Moab and Ammon had at one time possessed the district but had been dispossessed by Sihon, not by the Israelites, and consequently had no right to require Israel to restore it to them. If this were not the fundamental idea there was no need for Jephthah to take part in the discussion.

[3] See above, pp. 202, 212, 220, and add Deut. i. 46; Judges xi. 17.

[4] See Riehm's *HWB.*, pp. 802, 822; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 110.

[5] On p. 220 we have placed the arrival at Kadesh within the thirty-eight years. We cannot learn much by appealing to Num. xxxiii. 36 f.; here, too, some of the forty stations must be thought of as occupied a very long time. Kadesh will be one of them. It is very striking too that in this passage the stay in the Wilderness of Paran, to which P ascribes so much importance, is quite passed over in the list; and, in general, P in his text only partially adheres to Num. xxxiii. See below, p. 236.

time, and that unwillingly, in the district of Kadesh,[1] *i.e.* in the Wilderness of Sin, the northern part of the Wilderness of Paran, near to Canaan. The tradition states that about thirty-eight years were spent in the Desert, the greater part of the time in the district of Kadesh. And the sources are again at one in ascribing this to Israel's cowardly refusal to carry out a scheme for the conquest of Canaan from the south, framed by Moses, at Yahvé's command, in the second year after the Exodus from Egypt.

As to J this has been denied,[2] and the assertion made that he is not acquainted with the forty years' abode in the Desert. But the analysis of the sources which we have given above[3] makes such a deviation of J from E and P improbable.

I can see no reason for doubting that Israel did actually sojourn forty years in the Wilderness.[4] It is too well supported both by the Pentateuch and also by Amos v. 25. Supposing this to be the case, the most probable view will always be that Israel did not wander up and down the Desert the whole time, but for the greatest part of it had a fixed centre in Kadesh itself. That holds good whether we explain it in Wellhausen's way or in the one we have attempted above, whether, therefore, we adhere to there having been a prior scheme for conquering Canaan from the south or not.

5. Now we come to the events at Sinai. If the Passage through the Red Sea has been shown to be a historical fact, as we believe we have proved above, the natural direction of the Israelite march would be towards Sinai. If Egypt opposed the Exodus of the sons of Israel there was no better and likelier method of escaping from this disturbing influence than for Moses to interpose the broad arm of the sea between Egypt and Israel, in other words, to turn towards the southern end of the peninsula.[5]

The proof that this direction was taken is actually furnished

[1] As to the position of the place, see Palmer, *The Desert of the Exodus*, p. 350 ff.; *Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1871, p. 20 f.; and especially Trumbull, *Kadesh Barnea*, 1884; Hommel, *Gesch. Bab. u. Ass.*, p. 369.

[2] Meyer, *ZA W.* i. p. 140.

[3] *Cf.* p. 200 f.

[4] Hitzig also does this, *Gesch. Isr.*, p. 67; see also Duncker, *Gesch. d. Altert.*[5] i. p. 416.

[5] See Duncker, *Gesch. d. Altert.*[5] i. p. 419.

by an ancient fragment[1] which tells of a fight with Amalek and is ascribed by E, probably also by J, to Moses himself. Whether it was really composed by Moses or was written down by a later hand the fact remains, that one, if not both, of the narrators just mentioned had it and used it as a document of great antiquity. I look upon its Mosaic origin as quite possible. In any case the fragment must be regarded as a well-authenticated document concerning an event that happened in the time of Moses.

According to it Israel has a hostile encounter with Amalek shortly before reaching Sinai. The tradition has preserved for us the recollection that Moses was connected by marriage with the Arab tribe of the Midianites, who dwell near Sinai, and that he had lived a long time amongst them before placing himself at the head of Israel. Hence it is intrinsically probable that if Moses did not wish to meet with invincible obstacles to the deliverance of his people he would make sure of the help of the Arab tribes of Sinai. If he did not find amongst them friends for himself and his followers the enterprise was foredoomed to failure. It is therefore a thoroughly trustworthy feature of the narrative that the priestly sheikh of the Midianites, whose name, owing to the discrepancy of the traditions,[2] we are not quite sure of, stood in a close personal connection with Moses, his tribe, too, being in friendly relationship with Israel. The credibility of the statement that one of the Sinaitic Arab tribes approved of Israel's march through the Peninsula is not diminished by the fact that the name of the tribe remains doubtful.[3]

On the one hand, then, Israel meets with a welcome on the road and a recognition of the close relationship in origin and earlier history which connects it with the Arabs of the Peninsula of Sinai. But on the other hand, another of these tribes, the war-

[1] Exod. xvii. 8 ff.

[2] E calls him Jethro; J, Reuel; whilst Hobab (ben Reuel) appears as Zipporah's brother. See above, §§ 20, 21, especially p. 200.

[3] Usually called Midianites (in E and J), but beside this Kenites (Cain): see below, § 26, No. 1; also Stade, *Gesch.* i. p. 131 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 64 f. (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 44 ff); Dillm. *ExLev.* p. 18.

like Amalek, seeks to prevent it from reaching Sinai. The action of the Amalekites arises from their feeling that the oases of Sinai are their property and are hardly large enough to furnish pasture grounds which will suffice to support Israel as well as themselves. The battle is fought at Rephidim.[1] By Yahvé's help Israel gains the victory.

This leaves the road to Sinai open to Moses. He leads his people thither. The district round Sinai serves as their abode for a considerable period until they move on towards the north and so reach the border of the land which afterwards becomes their own. Events of the utmost importance to the people, affecting, indeed, their whole future, are to happen at the mountain so long sacred, in the midst of the most impressive surroundings to be found in the peninsula. Yahvé their God reveals Himself to them through Moses. Moses, the deliverer and leader of his people, here becomes their prophet and lawgiver.

The transactions at Sinai, so far as their details are concerned, are surrounded with a deep and almost impenetrable obscurity. There is hardly a point in the entire Old Testament tradition where the accounts are so complicated and confused as here. This is due to the editorial effort to give unity to the weightiest passage in the national history. Not even with respect to the name of the mountain do the traditions agree completely. Yet there can hardly be a doubt that it is one and the same mountain which E calls Horeb and J and P Sinai.[2] Still less is it possible to determine with absolute certainty, from the data supplied by our sources, which mountain of the great mountain-mass in the south of the peninsula is the one designated by that double name in the Old Testament.[3]

There can, however, be no doubt that they actually marched to Horeb-Sinai, *i.e.* to the mountain called by this name in Hebrew antiquity. The well-authenticated fight with the hostile Amalek

[1] On the position of the place, see Ebers, *Durch Gosen zu Sinai*[2] (1881), p. 221 ff. [2] On this see Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 24 f.

[3] *Cf.* the thorough discussion, where every relevant point is dealt with, in Ebers, *Durch Gosen zu Sinai*,[2] p. 392 ff.

made the road thither passable. If that is historical the onward march to Sinai is a fact. Moreover, we are in possession of independent information as to the purport of what happened at Sinai; with it we have a proof of the actual march, even when we leave aside the battle with the Amalekites.

The various threads of the narrative may be much tangled at this point also; but one thing stands out as the most important point in all the narratives:—the centre of everything that happens here is the revelation of Yahvé at Sinai in a law which is to rule the life of the people. With respect to the contents and compass of this law the narrators vary from each other more widely almost than as to the external history of the law-giving. Nothing could be more natural. For no other event could so interest the people; none would be so frequently reported as this. But with all their differences the narrators agree as to the thing itself.

If we now succeed in extracting the original kernel from the laws which to-day bear the name of Moses, we thereby make it very probable that we have in it the true Mosaic law, *i.e.* the rules which Moses himself laid down at Sinai for the regulation of his people's life. This probability would become certainty if we found ourselves in a position to trace the kernel back to Moses.

For both points the requisite evidence is forthcoming. The oldest elements, the very kernel of the Pentateuch legislation, are, as has already appeared, the portions included under the two titles, the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant. Now our documents[1] relate that the latter law was written by Moses himself at the bidding of Yahvé, and that the former, the Decalogue, was written by Yahvé on two tables of stone and delivered to Moses[2] Comparing the characteristics of the two portions with these statements, we cannot but see that neither the Decalogue nor the Book of the Covenant in their present form can be directly Mosaic. Criticism must be allowed a free hand in separating the later additions and enlargements, which here also are quite intelligible. When this is done the original kernel both of the one

[1] Exod. xxiv. 4, 7; xxxiv. 27. [2] Exod. xxxi. 18; xxxiv. 28; *cf. v.* 1.

document and of the other must remain. Their Mosaic origin is witnessed to in a manner which deserves the fullest credence: the infrequency with which such witness is borne; the contents, as well as the concise and lapidary style of these two fundamental laws; the history of the circumstances amidst which we have shown they originated—are sufficient proofs.[1]

6. This completes the circle of those leading facts which in my opinion can be directly shown to be historical from the Old Testament narratives. I do not deny that a number, possibly a considerable number, of statements found in the sources have equal claims to historical reliableness. But we are without the means to substantiate them. We have yet to speak of some details, few in number, but not unimportant.

For the camping-grounds of Israel in the desert we have not only the incidental statement in J and the remains of an ancient list of stations[2] in E, but also another much more complete enumeration[3] in P. This claims to be from the hand of Moses. At least P declares, in his introduction to the list, that Moses wrote it. It must therefore be concluded that P made use of an ancient list which was ascribed to Moses. But whether P himself enlarged and to some extent altered the ancient copy or one of his successors introduced changes, certain it is that Num. xxxiii. as it now stands is not the original, authentic list of stations which P found in existence. For in its present condition it agrees with P as little as with the other writers. It does not bring the people to Kadesh till the end of the journeyings.[4] At least it seems so: nothing is said about a prolonged stay at that place; and from there to the Jordan only nine stations are mentioned, whereas twenty-one have preceded. On the other hand the sojourn, which to P is so important, in the Desert of Paran-Sin, to which Kadesh belongs, is not so much as mentioned. This proves that P neither drew up the list nor used it in this

[1] In §§ 20 and 21 we have dealt fully with Wellhausen's denial of this and the consequences which he goes on to draw.

[2] Num. xxi. 12 f., 18*b*-20; Deut. x. 6.

[3] Num. xxxii.; *cf.* above, p. 231.

[4] Num. xxxiii. 36; *cf. v.* 37.

form. It must have been considerably modified by R, who, besides making some additions, greatly *abbreviated or altered*, especially in *v.* 36 f. To bring the list into harmony with the composite narrative of the Pentateuch as now arranged, he either omitted the stations after Kadesh or put Kadesh in a far later position than it occupied in the document he was working from.[1] This gives rise to the appearance that Israel did not reach Kadesh till so late a period, whereas E, J, and P bring them there (or to Paran) earlier.

Hence it is clear that Num. xxxiii. no longer gives us thoroughly reliable information respecting Israel's camping-grounds in the desert. For although it is based on an ancient document which, with its many names, was originally of the highest value, we no longer have it in its purity and in the order of the original. Moreover, it is just those names which are not mentioned in the narrative parts of the Pentateuch that present the greatest difficulties in the way of explanation.[2]

We also know very little about the numerical strength of the sons of Israel when they left Egypt and when they invaded Canaan.

P gives the number of men capable of bearing arms as six hundred thousand.[3] This would imply a total of two or three million souls, an estimate decidedly too high. The circumstances of Israel itself as well as those of Goshen and the Desert leave no doubt on that point.[4] Unfortunately R's endeavour after unity has led him to strike out the number E also gave, which was certainly not so high.[5] We are reduced to conjecture and our only datum is that supplied in the Song of Deborah.[6] But we shall have to put the number much higher than is mentioned there.

Finally, we must glance at the Desert Sanctuary set up by Moses. The elaborate picture drawn by P[7] of a costly Taber-

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 231 and 221.

[2] See Dillmann, *NuDtJo.*, on Num. xxxiii. ; for the rest *cf.* Riehm, *HWB.* Art. 'Lagerstätten.'

[3] Exod. xii. 37 ; Num. 1 f. (xi. 21 R?).

[4] See Schleiden, *Die Landenge von Sues*, p. 186 ff. ; Nöldeke, *Unters.*, p. 115 ; Reuss, *L'histoire sainte*, p. 85 ff. ; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 5 ff. But *cf.* also Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. 276 ff. (Eng. Trans. pp. 279 ff.) ; Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch.* i. p. 198.

[5] Exod. xii. 37. See above, p. 206.

[6] Judges v. 8 ; 'Forty thousand in Israel,' *i.e.* fit for arms.

[7] Exod. xxv. ff.

nacle in which the holy Ark was to be kept cannot be historical. This appears, not so much from the impossibility of constructing so costly and artistic a tent,[1] as from the fact that E's description gives us a glimpse into the far simpler character of the Mosaic Tent in the Wilderness.[2] E also knows that the tent was made out of the ornaments of the Israelites, being therefore a somewhat costly structure, yet it remains an ordinary tent, not a work of art and splendour. This is the historical fact.[3] The description in P corresponds to the idea which people in later times, influenced probably by what they saw of the continually increasing costliness of their sanctuaries, formed of the sacred desert-tent of the days of Moses. But the holy ark seems, even in the days of Moses, to have been the sanctuary, strictly so called, where Yahvé's presence was revealed.[4] It corresponds to the arks of other nations. As in later days it accompanied Israel to battle[5] in pledge of God's presence and help, so in the days of Moses it marches at the head of the people. But there was nothing in it save the two tables of the law. There is not a trace of its having resembled the heathen arks in containing an image of Yahvé or a holy stone.[6]

§ 24. *The same Subject continued.—Moses and his Religion.*

1. In the preceding paragraphs the name of Moses has been intentionally avoided as a rule, and only mentioned incidentally. But the tradition admittedly attributes to him the work of freeing Israel, leading them through the desert, and giving them their religion. The powerful and resolute personality of Moses is to it the deliverer of Israel, the author of its national life, the prophetic

[1] See the literature from Vater and de Wette to Graf, Colenso, and Kuenen, in Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 269, and in the Dictionaries. On the other side, especially Riggenbach, *Die mos. Stiftshütte*[2] (1867).

[2] Exod. xxxiii. 6 ff. The construction of it has dropped out between *vv.* 6 and 7, on account of Exod. xxv. ff., xxxi. ff. *Cf.* Num. x. 33 ff.

[3] Diodorus Siculus, 20, 65, mentions a similar object, the ἱερὰ σκηνή of the Carthaginians.

[4] Num. x. 33 ff.

[5] On this see especially Kautzsch, *ZA W.* vi. 17 ff.

[6] As Seinecke supposes, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 165 f.; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. pp. 448, 457; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.* i. p. 358.

founder of its religion. Has this view a historical foundation, or is it poetic legend that has created this figure and placed it as a brilliant phenomenon at the head of the history of the nation?

It has been shown that the story of the Exodus and of the Wandering through the Desert contains at least a few leading statements the historical validity of which is beyond question. Israel left Egypt, passed through the Red Sea to Sinai, received there the system of worship and of life which it afterwards observed, pursued its journey thence to Kadesh and then to the eastern boundary of Canaan. In fact, we still possess some documents that claim, and in all probability justly claim, to belong to that period of wandering in the desert, which is briefly designated the Mosaic age. It is true that only one of those ancient documents actually contains the name of Moses.[1] But considering how meagre is our oldest information, that one is important. Besides this the narrators are careful to bring into the closest connection with Moses not only the entire work wrought by the nation in those days but also in particular a portion of those documents. Some also amongst the earlier of the prophets who made use of writing,[2] even when they do not expressly mention Moses, are not able to think of the height reached in the ancient days except in connection with his person.

But there is also a general consideration which fully evinces the historical existence of Moses. If the events of that period are, as a whole, beyond dispute, they demand for their explanation such a personality as the sources give us in Moses. Everything shows that Israel in Egypt had no pretension to be a nation: its nationality had yet to be created. The spirit of national unity and self-assertion had yet to be breathed into the oppressed and enslaved masses which were in danger of losing their individuality. Such a work does not accomplish itself. It is only wrought when there is a personality behind the mass, towering above them, urging them on, setting on fire with its own holy enthusiasm the

[1] The account of the fight with the Amalekites, Exod. xvii.
[2] Hos. xii. 14; Micah vi. 4; *cf.* Jer. vii. 25; Isa. lxiii. 11.

consciousness of nationality. Israel became a nation at the Exodus. Moses created it. Without him Israel would have remained what it was before.

Then came the Exodus itself and the events at Sinai. The march from Egypt and through the Wilderness, the fight with the pursuing Egyptians and the hostile Amalekites, and all the rest of the desert experiences, imply that the movement was directed by a single strong hand. Such a work could not have been carried out by the unorganised Hebrew families which Moses found in Egypt, which attached themselves to him. There needed a captain, able to sway the multitude, to hold together conflicting elements, to support the faint-hearted, to ward off the foe, to compose quarrels—in short, a leader of genius, a circumspect general and judge, a resolute, daring patriot at the head of the newly formed nation.[1]

There remains still a class of facts which are even less capable than the successes already mentioned of being explained apart from a specially inspired prophetic personality. I mean the new religious creation in Israel; the new revelation of God and of law, which is so closely connected with the stay in the Desert. Nothing is less likely to arise spontaneously out of the depths of a people's life than those new creations which make epochs in the history of religion and morals. They slumber there, but they do not come to the surface until a single spirit, of whom they have taken entire possession, finds them in himself, grasps them, understands and proclaims them, and thus becomes the religious and moral hero, the prophet of his people. The mere name Moses would do nothing. If legend had created the bearer of that name, another must have actually filled his place. But seeing that it is well authenticated and hardly has a Hebrew ring,[2] we have every reason for retaining it.

2. If, then, Moses is a historical person, his chief importance

[1] See Duncker, *Gesch. d. Altert.*[5] i. p. 397 f.

[2] See Josephus. *Arch.* ii. 9. 6; *c. Apion*, i. 31; but, more correctly, Lepsius, *Chronol.* i. p. 326; Ebers, *Durch Gosen*,[2] p. 539.

will consist in the religious and moral creation he effected. This is the grandest, most fruitful, and enduring of his productions. It gave a certain durability and firmness in later days to that provisional unity of the people, which in the first place was due to his personal character and the pressure of circumstances. It was the foundation on which the state-life of Israel was afterwards built. And though the latter was speedily destroyed, that creation survived. Amidst the crushing blows of fate which the centuries of history have dealt Israel's nationality, this creation has preserved it from destruction, for a long time keeping it in vigour, and to the present day maintaining it in feeble life, though in many respects degenerate and perverted. Long after the state was devoted to destruction and the people given up to divisions and fruitless party strife, the religion of Israel continued to bring to ripeness impulses vigorous with life and subduing the world.

How is this enigma of history to be explained? Certainly not from any attempt on the part of Moses to establish a world-wide religion. Nor was it from any specially favourable destiny or circumstances giving his people and work an advantage over others. Amongst other nations, indeed, whose power was immeasurably greater or whose influence was much more likely to ensure the spread and perpetuation of their religion, the external conditions were far more favourable. Why, then, was not the same significance attained by the faith of the Nileland, by that of Mesopotamia, by the religious systems of the Philistines and the seafaring Canaanites? There must have been something in the religion of Moses from the very first which made a special development possible. There must have lived within it a power of gradually unfolding until it reached the might and splendour, the purity, power, and elevation which we see in later times. Unfavourable circumstances could not stay this, neither could the weakness and ruin of the nation; nay, it vanquished at last every unfavourable element, drawing each of these into its own service. In other words, Moses himself must have given something to his people that raised their faith above that of the other nations, making it

purer, more fruitful, more capable of development. We must inquire what this was.

In the prophets, from Amos and Hosea downwards, the so-called ethical monotheism of Israel finds its complete expression. Several attempts have recently[1] been made, in continuation of still earlier ones,[2] to prove that this was not the religion of the Mosaic age, but a product of that period of the literary prophets which has been called in the stricter sense the prophetic age. The prophetic faith is supposed to have necessarily developed in its purity, under the influence of world-wide events, out of the so-called pre-prophetic faith which Israel held in the age preceding the prophetic one.

It would, of course, be difficult to deny that the faith of the earlier age, and consequently that of Moses himself, must in many respects have been of a different kind and a less developed form than that of the prophetic epoch. The idea of the world and the world-empire, which was beaten into the trembling hearts of the prophets by the pitiless hammer-strokes of fate, was unknown to Moses and his age. Assyria first taught what a world-empire and a world-ruler was. Not till then did the prophets contrast the super-earthly universal King, the world-ruler Yahvé, with the earthly Great King, and the empire of God with the empire of the world. And if the world-empire and the world were outside the circle of Moses's vision, it follows that the same is true of that divine moral government of the world which moves everything in it so as to serve the ends of the Kingdom of God. The prophets only became acquainted with this through the conflict betwixt the ideal and the real, through the cruel distresses of their age, the struggle after harmony and after the reconciliation of the bitter realities of Israel's hopeless present with the idea they held of God. They did not invent that idea of the Kingdom of God and

[1] Kuenen, *Godsdienst van Israel*; Duhm, *Theologie der Propheten*; Wellh. *Abriss* (*Sketch of the Hist. of Isr. and Judah*); Stade, *Gesch. Isr.*; Kuen. *Hibbert Lectures on National Religions and Universal Religions.*

[2] Especially Vatke's *Bibl. Theol.* i. For the rest of the literature, see König, *Die Hauptprobleme der altisr. Religionsgesch.* (1884), p. 2 f.

the moral government of the world, but they discovered it as soon as they drew together the threads of the faith they had inherited from Moses, and wove thereinto the picture of their own quite different times.

On the other hand, however, there is no justification for explaining the progress which the prophets made by developing the Mosaic ideas, in such a way as to imply that the earlier period, including that of Moses, was a time of mere nature-religion, whilst Moses himself retained the heathenism common to all the Semites, merely transferring to it the name Yahvé.[1] If this had been the case, and the religion of Moses had been nothing more than the heathenism of all the Semites, practised under the name of Yahvé, there would be no way of explaining the effects which that religion produced in the earlier days of Israel or the powerful development which we have already spoken of. For it would then be incomprehensible why Chemosh or Baal, or Amon-Ra and Ilu, were not able to rival Yahvé.

The view which we thus reject loses sight of two points. In the first place the prophets never aimed at founding a new faith.[2] Fully conscious that they were adapting Israel's ancient faith to fresh circumstances, their constant purpose was simply to uphold and renew the old faith which in their time had been forgotten and left aside. When they proclaim their weightiest truths they feel themselves in full accord with the Torah of Yahvé, which the people knew, and had heard long before.[3] Further, I cannot agree with the practice which has recently found many adherents of taking the whole period prior to the prophets as a homogeneous whole and contrasting it with the prophetic period. We cannot deny that in the days of the Judges and of the first kings Israel

[1] Against older writers, such as Kaiser, Daumer, Ghillany and others, see Dillm. *Ueber den Ursprung. d. alttest. Relig.*, 1865; also, more recently, König, *Hauptprobl.* p. 7 ff.

[2] See König, *Hauptprobl.*, p. 14 f.

[3] *Cf.* such expressions as Amos ii. 4, 'Judah rejects the Torah of Yahvé;' Hosea ii. 15, 'Israel has forgotten Yahvé'; iv. 6, 'He hath forgotten the Torah of his God;' viii. 12, 'Yahvé hath written for Israel a multitude of Toroth;' Micah vi. 8, 'Man is told what Yahvé requires.'

appropriated many elements of the Canaanite nature-religion. But this does not justify us in ignoring the fact that in many respects those times show a declension as compared with the Mosaic. The elevation of the Mosaic period, the living, original force and enthusiasm of a great creative age, which it undeniably manifested, are quite forgotten when the popular belief and the institutions of the age after Moses are taken as the standard for the so-called pre-prophetic period, and the Mosaic age is depicted in accordance with it.

The Mosaic age and the work of Moses must rather be understood by considering what they were in themselves, and what were the forces that lived in them. The key to these can only be found in the scanty, yet sufficient sources of the history of Moses. For our question, the Mosaic Decalogue is decisive. The peculiarity of the religion of Moses must be learned from it.

The Decalogue as we now have it is provided with many explanatory additions and enlargements. The Ten Words which were inscribed on the tables of stone may have run as follows:[1]—

1.

I am Yahvé thy God (who brought thee out of the land of Egypt).

I. Thou shalt have no other gods besides Me.

II. Make to thyself no image.

III. Thou shalt not use the name of Yahvé thy God to deceive.

IV. Remember the Sabbath Day, to keep it holy.

V. Honour thy father and mother.

2.

VI. Do no murder.

VII. Do not commit adultery.

VIII. Do not steal.

[1] *Cf.* Ewald, *Gesch Isr.*[3] ii. p. 231 (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 231); Vatke, *Einl.* p. 338. Vatke strikes out No. II, and places the superscription as No. I, but this introduces confusion, compelling us to begin the second table with No. V.

IX. Do not bear false witness against thy neighbour.
X. Do not covet thy neighbour's house.

The programme of the new religion is contained in the sentence which introduces the Ten Words: 'I am Yahvé thy God.'[1] This introduction to the Decalogue, combined with the definite assertion[2] on the subject by E and P as well as by the prophets,[3] make it extremely difficult to believe that the name Yahvé was known to Israel prior to Moses.[4] The solitary name compounded with Yahvé in earlier times, that of Jochebed, the mother of Moses, does not seem to me to be any proof of this. Its meaning[5] is so obscure as to make it very possible that it has been altered into a form more in accordance with the new faith.

Opinions vary as to the significance of the name Yahvé. In any case, it cannot be right to seek it outside the limits of the Hebrew,[6] not to say the Semitic tongues.[7] But within that range there remains a choice between two leading explanations, one of which makes the word to be a Qal,[8] the other a Hiphil[9] form. The former would mean: 'He who is,' the latter: 'He who causes to be, the Creator.'[10] In either case the import of the name

[1] Wellh. *Abriss*, p. 9 ff. (Eng. Ed. p. 8), lays special, but unduly exclusive, stress on this.

[2] Exod. iii. 14; vi. 3. J's use of the name in the primal history is not due to a theory, but to a naïve lack of historical exactness.

[3] Hos. xii. 10; xiii. 4; Ezek. xx. 5.

[4] Tholuck, *Ueb. d. Ursprung d. Nam. Jahvé* (*Verm. Schr.* 1867), p. 201; Nestle, *Isr. Eigennam.*, p. 80; Kuen. *Godsd.* i. p. 276.

[5] See Nestle, *Eigennam.*, p. 77.

[6] As Hartmann, Land, Movers, Lenormant, do; moreover Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 158 ff.; Schrader, *KAT.*[2] pp. 23 ff., 162 ff. (Eng. Trans. i. pp. 23 ff. 150 ff.) On the other side see Baud. *Studien*, i. p. 222 ff.; Nestle, *Eigennam.*, p. 83 f.; Dillm. *ExLev.* p. 34; Philippi, in *Ztschr. für Völkerpsych.*, 1883, p. 175 ff.

[7] Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 672; J. G. Müller, *Die Semiten in ihr Verh. zu d. Indog.* p. 163 ff.; Roth, *Gesch. uns. Abendl. Phil.* i. p. 146.

[8] Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 33; Delitzsch in *PRE.*[2] vi. p. 503; Mühlau-Volck, *Lex.*[10] p. 326.

[9] Lagarde, *ZDMG.* xxii. p. 330 f.; *Psalter juxta Hebr. Hier.*, p. 153 ff.; Schrader, *ZDMG.* xxxiv. p. 404, and in Schenkel's *Bibl. Lex.*, Art. 'Jahve;' Baud. *Studien*, i. p. 229; Nestle, *Eigennam.*, pp. 89, 91 ff.

[10] I prefer the second explanation: the first appears to me too abstract (see my remarks in the *Lit. Centr. Bl.*, 1881, Sp. 171). Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 429, has recently conjectured that it means 'He who strikes down:' prior to him *cf.* also Nestle, *Eigenn.*, p. 92.

chosen for God gives rise to a striking difference, altogether in favour of Israel, between the divine names used by the neighbouring peoples and that used in Israel. Baal, Moloch, Milcom, etc., express nothing but the consciousness of dependence: the adoring man is at the same time the ministering slave. It is true that Yahvé, like all other gods, is often enough called the Lord. But the essence of His relation to Israel, as expressed in His chief name, is not ruling might and lordly power, but the aid that helps one forward. The basis is thus already laid for the idea that Israel is God's firstborn son, that God loves Israel.[1] The very name Yahvé, when the depth of its meaning is grasped, rises above the nature-religions. If Israel afterwards frequently enough looked on it as being merely one divine name amongst the rest,[2] even interchanging it with Baal, this was a forgetting of its meaning. To Moses the name must have signified more.

The prohibition of the worship of other gods besides Yahvé raises Israel's faith still higher above that of other nations. We know not whether Moses believed in the existence of other gods besides Yahvé; he says nothing about this. Israel after Moses did partially admit it.[3] Hence we cannot say whether Moses connected with this command an absolute or a relative monotheism, God's sole unity in the strictest sense or simply His unlikeness to all others. In any case his idea is loftier by far than that of the surrounding religions. In them a single god may claim the first place as supreme over the other gods; but he tolerates them alongside himself. Each of these deities has a female principle corresponding to him, or minor deities subordinate to him. Yahvé alone allows of no other God besides Himself.[4] Polytheism and its unfailing accompaniment, nature-religion, are thus in principle vanquished.

[1] Exod. iv. 22.

[2] See the next note. Our admission does not imply that Israel took up just the same position towards Yahvé as Moab to Chemosh, Ammon to Milcom, etc. (Kuen. *Godsd.* i. p. 222; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. pp. 5, 113, 429; and especially Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. p. 372). See König, *Hauptpr.*, p. 39.

[3] Especially Judges xi. 24; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19 f. On this see especially Baud. *Studien*, i. p. 55 ff.

[4] Stade's view also, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 438.

Israel is Jahvé's people. It receives His help in war[1] and in the bounties of nature.[2] But this help may be withheld if Israel has brought on itself Yahvé's wrath.[3] Moreover, it receives from Him His Torah, the declaration of His will. In the name of Yahvé, Moses pronounces judgment[4] and gives laws. This again may be found amongst other nations. To them too the gods are not mere givers of life and blessing, but may be guardians of justice and morality, avengers of human guilt. In comparatively early times, the Assyrians sang searching penitential psalms. But everything depends on the contents of the law and the ordinances. The law revealed by Moses is a purer, chaster, more complete expression of what is good than can be found in the ordinances and morals of their neighbours. And if its prescriptions are closely related to those given in the Egyptian Book of the Dead,[5] it yet breathes another spirit, that of genuine piety, true humanity, noble dignity, liberty and respect for man.[6]

It is a matter of dispute whether Mosaism was conversant with the idea of Yahvé's moral holiness, because later times often understood His holiness as a physical quality, as consuming power and unapproachableness.[7] But if the idea was lacking it is evident, as regards the thing itself, that a religion in which God Himself, in so many respects, is the fountain and guardian, not merely of what is supposed to be good, but of the really good and morally pure, *i.e.* of the holy, cannot have been far removed from divine holiness in that higher sense. And if Moses had not reached the idea of the moral government of the world, no one can deny that he had reached that of the moral government of the *nation.* Investigators are also not agreed as to whether Moses had grasped the notion of the covenant which Yahvé made with Israel, and had

[1] Exod. xiv. f. (Judges v.); Exod. xvii.; the 'Wars of Yahvé.'

[2] Exod. xiv. 21 (רוח קדים); also sustenance in the Desert and the leading them into Canaan.

[3] Num. xiv.; see above, p. 231 f.

[4] Exod. xv. 26; *cf.* Josh. xxiv. 25.

[5] Ebers in Rïehm's *HWB.*, p. 322*a*; Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 206.

[6] See my *Sittliche Fragen* (1885), p. 131.

[7] Kuenen, *Hibbert Lect.*, p. 112 f.; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 433 f. On the other side Bredenkamp, *Ges. und Prof.*, p. 41 ff.; König, *Hauptpr.*, p. 80 ff.

made it known to his age.[1] Here again the thought of a contract, based on a reciprocity of obligations, may very probably have originated in the reflection of later times. But the thing itself, the conclusion at Sinai of a covenant, the terms of which are contained in the 'Book of the Covenant,' is too plainly handed down[2] to allow of our deeming it a mere transference of later ideas to earlier times. If the *berith* was at first conceived of, not as a contract, but as an arrangement made by one of the parties, God, it would be easy afterwards to advance to that idea of a reciprocal obligation which is involved in the word itself. This might come about spontaneously, and, as Canaanite analogy shows, earlier than the prophetic age.[3] We may believe that the idea of a *Baal Berith* passed over from Israel to the heathen, rather than *vice versâ*.

If then the Yahvé of Moses in so many respects stands above the gods of the neighbouring tribes, we cannot possibly be surprised to see that Moses teaches that no images of Him may be formed.[4] This is the part of the Decalogue on which most doubt has been thrown.[5] And appeal has been specially made to the undeniable fact that, in post-Mosaic times, Yahvé was long worshipped under an image, and that this met with comparatively little opposition.[6] But the difficulty thus created is not got rid of by striking out of the Decalogue the prohibition of images. The central sanctuary with which we become acquainted in the times of Solomon, David, and Eli, undoubtedly possessed no image of Yahvé.[7] Hence those times must have known of the prohibition. And yet in spite of the prohibition we find the inclination to image-worship in the times of the Judges and the Kings. So

[1] Wellh. *Gesch. Isr.*[1] p. 434 f.; *Prol.*[2] p. 443 f. (Eng. Trans., p. 417 f.); *Abriss*, p. 44 (Eng. Trans., p. 114). On the other side, Bredenkamp, *Ges. und Prof.*, p. 21 ff.; König, *Hauptpr.*, p. 84 ff. [2] Exod. xxiv. 4 ff.

[3] See Baethgen in *Theol. Lit. Z.*, 1887, No. 4.

[4] See König, *Die Bildlosigkeit des legitimen Jahvecultus* (1886); also his *Hauptpr.*, p. 53 ff.; Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 208 f.

[5] Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.* i. p. 233 f.; Dozy, *Die Isr. zu Mekka*, p. 38; Kuen. i. pp. 232 f., 283 ff.; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 466.

[6] See especially Stade, *Gesch Isr.* i. p. 499 ff.

[7] Stade, p. 466, seems to contest this.

firmly did it at last establish its fixed seats in the northern kingdom from the time of Jeroboam I. onwards, that even Elijah and Elisha in their struggle against the foreign cultus were obliged to tolerate this illegitimate cultus of Yahvé. At least we know of no declaration against it on their part. This shows conclusively that the actual practice of image-worship does not justify the inference that there was no prohibition of it. The same conclusion is reached by comparing the occasional practice of a foreign cultus, in which even Solomon took part, with the prohibition of the worship of other gods. If, on the other hand, we investigate the history in order to discover the point where this prohibition could have arisen, we are inevitably carried back to the time of Moses. The prohibition of images must therefore have formed part of his legislation. By it he meant to place the worship of Yahvé in definite contrast to that materialising of the deity which was common in heathenism. By it his religion reached its highest point above the sensuous nature-worship of polytheism.

Let us now bring together the peculiarities which raised the religion founded by Moses above the heathen religions ensuring to it the future, making it the most precious possession of Israel and of mankind: it knows its God, not as the mighty potentate, but as the life-giving helper, in whom the idea of Love is involved; it knows Him as the God *sui generis*, who allows of the existence of no other, and in this exclusiveness involves His absolute Unity; it recognises Him as the dispenser of justice and the judge, from the loftiness of whose commands and judicial sentences it divines His holiness and covenant-faithfulness; it acknowledges Him as the non-sensuous, the spiritual, and thus completes its protest against the prevalent forms of faith.

3. A word remains to be said as to the source whence Moses drew this faith. The negative side of the answer has already been given. If we may take it as proved that the name Yahvé was not of foreign origin, it follows that the idea and worship of Yahvé cannot have been borrowed from abroad. Egypt is the only land

that can be seriously thought of in this connection. For some time it was a favourite opinion that Moses adopted the idea of Yahvé from the esoteric doctrine taught in Egypt:[1] this needs no lengthy refutation now.[2] It would be more to the point to inquire whether Moses adopted the name and worship of Yahvé from one of the less strictly so-called Hebrew tribes. In support of this we have been reminded that Moses received his first revelation of Yahvé during his stay with the priest of Midian, that he afterwards was influenced by this man, and finally, that Sinai itself, Yahvé's abode, lay in the territory of that Midianite-Kenite desert tribe.[3] But we have no information as to the really critical point that Yahvé was originally the god of the Kenites,[4] which is all the more surprising seeing that we are still able to trace the Kenite influence on the tradition in another matter, the constitution of Israel.[5]

It must be held then that Yahvé, the Creator of life, the sole Ruler, the Invisible, was neither known previously in Israel nor made known to Moses by outsiders. Even if He were, it was only so far as the name, not the import of the idea, was concerned. Nothing remains, therefore, but to hold that the faith in Yahvé which Moses taught sprang up originally within his own soul. Impulses may have been communicated to him from without. A few solitary ideas belonging to the Egyptian system of doctrine may have fertilised his thoughts. He would be repelled, too, by the multiplicity, the sensuousness and the unworthiness of the deities worshipped by the Egyptians and the Semites. Then, in the solitude of the desert, he sought and found the true nature of God. Like a lightning flash the thought would pass through his

[1] See the literature in Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Religionsgesch.* i. pp. 313, 317; König, *Hauptpr.*, p. 31.

[2] See Dillm. *Ursp. d. alttest. Rel.*, p. 12 f.; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 131; König, *Hauptpr.*, p. 31; Saussaye, *Religionsgesch.*, p. 317. And as to the supposed teaching of the unity of God in Egypt, Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 492; but also Meyer, *Gesch. Ägypt.*, pp. 194, 196, 249 f., 260 ff.

[3] Von der Alm; Tiele, *Vergel. Geschied.*, p. 555 ff.; *Compend.*, p. 94; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 130 f.

[4] See Baud. *Studien*, i. p. 228.

[5] Exod. xviii.

soul that the greatest boon he could confer on the people he was determined to deliver was the knowledge of the Deity. Thus he entered on a struggle on behalf of his people and—probably not knowing, yet possibly suspecting its greatness—for the whole of mankind, a struggle than which there has been none mightier in the realm of the spirit and of civilisation, in the history of the world.

The significance of that struggle for a new conception of God can be estimated by any one who possesses two qualifications. He must know the illusions and the degrading bondage in which the people of the Nileland were held, owing, doubtless, to their view of God. He must reflect on the religious usages of Hither Asia which deeply wounded man's moral sense and trampled the dignity of human nature in the dust: these, with their bewildering orgies, he must compare with the spirit of the religion of Moses.[1] Nature-religion, with its tendency to enslave man, to set at nought his natural freedom and moral dignity, could not but rob the nations in ever-increasing measure of their civilisation and humanity. By his religion Moses won for his people and the world *the road to freedom, human dignity, and the development of pure humanity.*

How did that new and lofty knowledge of God finds its way into the soul of Moses? That remains the secret of his great spirit! Every genius on earth is a riddle for history. The religious genius is the greatest enigma of all. The history of its time enables you to explain in part each new creation of genius, but leaves an unexplained residuum. Yet the religious creation leaves the largest residuum, because it pierces deepest into the hidden foundations of life.

The historian finds himself confronted here with a mystery to which there is hardly any parallel in history. A solution can only be found by inserting into that blank a factor, the historical justification of which we are not in a position to make out strictly. There are points in the life of mankind where history passes over

[1] See Ranke, *Weltgesch.* I. i. p. 37 f.

into the philosophy of history, and speculation, with its interpreting light, must illuminate the steps of a historical process which otherwise will remain obscure. We have such a point here. Nothing but an immediate contact of God Himself with man can produce the true knowledge of God or bring man a real step nearer thereto.[1] For in himself man finds only the world and his own individuality. Neither the one nor the other of these leads beyond heathenism; that to a lower, this to a higher form. When the thought flashed across the mind of Moses that God was neither the world nor an idealised image of man, but that He was the Lord of life, the Author of the moral law, enthroned above the manifold and the world of sense, ennobling and not depressing man, that knowledge came neither from his age nor from himself: it came to him from the immediate revelation of this God in his heart.

§ 25. *The Foreign Accounts.*

It used to be thought very important that the proofs of the real occurrence of the events ascribed to this period should be supported by foreign accounts,[2] Egyptian in particular. Of late, however, these attempts have often been looked on very sceptically, perhaps too sceptically.[3] I have endeavoured to show that the credibility of the main features of the Mosaic history does not stand in need of foreign support. With all the less prepossession, therefore, will it now be possible to estimate the value of those documents from outside Israel. If those supports turn out unreliable we shall have no need to lament; if any one of them hold good, it will but serve as a welcome confirmation of our results.

We have already seen[4] that much stress was laid on the

[1] See Dillm. *Ueber d. Ursp. d. altt. Religion*, p. 19 ff.

[2] As to the later extra-Biblical narratives concerning Moses, especially Jewish ones, see L. v. Ranke's essay, *Ueber die Darstellung der Geschichte des Moses in den Antiquitäten des Flav. Josephus*, in his *Weltgesch.* iii. 2, p. 12 f.

[3] Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 129; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altt.* i. p. 349.

[4] See above, p. 183, and especially Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 491; and now see especially Meyer, *Gesch. Ägypt.*, p. 297 (Apuriu = Workman, not the name of a people at all).

supposed finding of the name of the Hebrews in Egyptian witnesses. Could this be verified, it would obviously be of the utmost importance to us. But we saw that although there is much to be said for the identification of the Egyptian 'Apuriu with our 'Ibrîm it is in the highest degree uncertain, and consequently cannot be used in support of the Biblical statements.

Still more emphatically does this verdict apply to the name Moses, which was also supposed to be found in Egyptian sources.[1]

The question is whether Ed. Naville's latest excavations have introduced any important change into the state of the problem.[2] Hence we must examine them somewhat more in detail. In the first place they have at all events done something for Biblical geography. Formerly almost every one agreed in looking for the site of Pithom, a town which plays a part in the Mosaic history, at Tell el-Kebir, or a little south-west of it at Tell Abu-Suleiman:[3] Raamses, on the other hand, was located at Tell el-Maskhuta (Abu Keishib[4]). But Naville has proved that Tell el-Maskhuta occupies the site of the ancient Pithom.[5] There is another point where his

[1] See Lauth, *Moses der Ebräer*, 1868, and *Moses Osarsyph.* in *ZDMG.* xxv. (1871), p. 139 ff. *Cf.* also *Moses Hosarsyphos*, 1879, and *Aus Ägypt. Vorzeit*, 1881. On the other side see Köhler, *Bibl. Ges.* i. p. 236; Dillm. *ExLev.*, p. 16; Ebers, *Gosen*,[2] p. 561; Orelli in *PRE.*[2] x. p. 305; Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 492.

[2] Ed. Naville, *The Store City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus* (2nd ed.), Lond. 1885. *Cf.* especially Dillm. *Ueber Pithom, Hero, Klysma* in *Sitz-Ber. d. Berl. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1885, xxxix.; also Naville, *Pithom-Heroopolis* in *Acad.* xxv. (22nd March 1884); Brugsch, *Pithom und Ramses* in *Deutsche Revue*, März, 1884; R. S. Poole, *Pithom* in *Acad.* xxv. (24th May 1884); Ebers in *Münch. Alg. Zeitg.*, 1885, No. 110 f. (Beil.), and in *Zeitschr. f. Ägypt. Spr.*, 1885, p. 45 ff; Lansing, '*Pithom the Treasure City*,' in *Monthly Interp.*, Nov. 1885; Meyer, *Gesch. Ag.* p. 297; Bunsen, '*The Pharaoh of Moses, etc.*,' *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, 1890 (xii.), p. 157 ff.; Lewis, '*Some Suggestions respecting the Exodus*,' *ibid.*, p. 167 ff.; Brugsch, '*Pithom and Ramses*,' *Jüd. Lit. Blat.*, 1890, Nos. 14-18.

[3] Lepsius, *Chronol.*, pp. 345, 357; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 20 f. (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 13); Schleiden, *Landenge von Suês*, pp. 165, 173 f.; Dillm. *ExLev.* p. 7; Ebers, *Durch Gosen*,[1] p. 496.

[4] Lepsius, *Chronol.*, p. 345 ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 18 (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 11); Schleiden, *Landenge von Suês*, p. 175 f.; Dillm. *ExLev.* p. 8; Ebers, *Durch Gosen*,[2] p. 514 ff.

[5] See Naville, *Store City of Pithom*, p. 5 ff., and on the other side Lepsius, *Zeitschr. f. Ägypt. Spr.*, 1883, p. 41 ff. and p. 29 ff. *Cf.* Dillm. *Pithom, Hero, Klysma*, p. 2 f.

conclusion can hardly be disputed. In Tell-el-Maskhuta he found the remains of rectangular rooms, built of brick, and open above. He infers that these were granaries, and Pithom, as Exodus represents it, a town that contained public storehouses.[1] The situation of the place on the eastern border of Egypt, and the fact that the Pharaohs engaged in many campaigns against Syria do but confirm this view.

What does history gain by this? We get the conviction that the writer who mentions Pithom was well informed both as to its situation and as to the purpose for which it was destined. His knowledge of these facts is fitted to inspire confidence in his description of other matters. There was nothing to prevent his connecting legendary events with places known to history and familiar to himself. More than this we may not infer.

Naville, however, believes that his excavations have done more than merely contribute to this rectification of our geographical knowledge. The following names of kings, permitting of a determination of the date of the respective portions of the excavation, have been found at Pithom: Rameses II., Sheshonq I., Osorkon II. But no name points to a ruler earlier than the time of Rameses II.[2] We already know from other sources that Rameses II. did some building in this neighbourhood.[3] And when the Bible states that Pharaoh built a town called Raamses[4] along with Pithom, it is natural to think of Rameses II. as the builder of both towns.[5] We cannot, then, avoid ascribing considerable weight to the fact on which Naville lays stress. If it receives further confirmation and no names of earlier kings or other proofs of higher antiquity are discovered in Tell el-Maskhuta, we shall be

[1] *Store City of Pithom*, p. 9 f. Lansing, *ut supra*, objects that, the grain being kept without protection from above, these open rooms would be exposed to the inundation. [But they would hardly be more exposed than unprotected heaps of grain.]

[2] Naville, *Store City of Pithom*, p. 11 f.

[3] See Weidemann, *Agypt. Gesch.*, pp. 441, 443 f.

[4] Exod. i. 11.

[5] We can hardly think of Rameses I. He seems to have shown no inclination towards building (Wiedemann, *Agypt. Gesch.*, p. 414).

compelled by this concurrence of indications to believe that Rameses II. was the actual builder of Pithom.[1]

This, however, does not amount to a direct statement on the monuments that Rameses II. oppressed the Hebrews. Much less do they state that it was with their help he built Pithom and Raamses, and that thereupon they fled from Egypt under him or his successor. The Egyptian sources of information do not supply a convincing proof of the actual occurrence of these facts. But they do furnish a not inconsiderable support to the Biblical narrative. For these discoveries compel us, at any rate for the present, to date the building of the towns within the period in which the Bible fixes the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt. If, then, the Biblical narrator, after the lapse of centuries, knew the precise time when this building took place, he must have had an acquaintance with the past which shews, far more than his geographical knowledge, how well informed he was.

Naturally we have not yet eliminated the possibility of E's having obtained information respecting the building of Pithom and Raamses by means of scholarly investigation and then having attached to this the national tradition of the Israelites concerning the oppression and Exodus of the Hebrews. But every one will admit that this supposition involves grave difficulties. Any Hebrew who had once been in Egypt could easily ascertain the existence, situation, and character of the Egyptian cities. To investigate the history of a city several centuries old would be a much more difficult task, especially to a foreigner. Unhesitatingly, and with a good historical conscience, we may assert that the theory according to which E here followed an ancient tradition, still living amongst his people, keeping the actual events in memory, which is now supported by the discovery that the statements about Pithom are correct, is far more probable than the theory that E collected literary information in Egypt respecting the

[1] Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 444, also holds that Rameses II. built Tanis, which must probably be identified with the Biblical Raamses (see Meyer, § 240). But according to Exod. i. 11, Raamses and Pithom go together.

building of those cities and connected it with the Israelite legend.

If the Egyptian testimonies thus make it highly probable that Rameses II. built Pithom, and, as the Bible subjoins, employed the Hebrews in this work, the question as to the date of the Exodus would be at least approximately solved. Rameses II. would be the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and the only remaining question would be whether the Exodus took place under him or one of his successors.

Hence the majority of recent inquirers have agreed that Rameses II. is the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and have assigned the Exodus of the Hebrews partly to the reign of his successor Merenptah and partly to the disturbed period of the transition from the nineteenth to the twentieth Egyptian dynasty. People used to be inclined to follow an ancient tradition which connected Israel's abode in Egypt with the invasion of the so-called Hyksos. More recently opinion has inclined to the view that the expulsion of the lepers from Egypt, related by Manetho, has a much better claim to be brought into connection with that event.

The main facts of the case are as follows:—

Josephus[1] asserts that a narrative which he gives was contained in Manetho's History. It states that during the reign of the Egyptian king, Timæus (Timaos and Timaios), foreigners of unknown origin[2] attacked Egypt from the east and conquered it. The natives were ill-treated, the temples demolished, and one of the barbarians, called Salatis, became king of Egypt. He lived at Memphis, and fortified specially the east of the country against an invasion which he dreaded from the powerful Assyrians. In the Saite (more correctly Seth-roite)[3] Nome he built the city which according to an ancient legend[4] was called Avaris, so as to

[1] *Against Apion*, i. 14. *Cf.* Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* x. 13; Jul. Afric. and Euseb. in *Syncell.*, ed. Bonn, i. p. 113 f.

[2] According to Manetho, as reported by Josephus, some said that they were Arabs. In Afric. and Euseb. they are called Phœnicians.

[3] So in Jul. Afric. and Euseb. For Salatis these writers have Saïtes.

[4] Respecting the locality of this town (=Hatu'ar), see Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. § 110.

make of it a very strong fortress. It held a garrison of two hundred and forty thousand men and became the mainstay of his power. He was succeeded by a line of rulers whose names Manetho gives.[1] The people bore the name of Hyksos. Hyk is said to have meant, in the sacred tongue, *king*, and Sos signified *shepherd*, so that the sense of the whole was *shepherd kings*.[2] When the strangers had ruled over Egypt five hundred and eleven years[3] Alisphragmuthosis (Misphragmuthosis)[4] succeeded at last in conquering them, and his son Thummosis arranged for their peaceable withdrawal. They went into the desert, settled afterwards in Judæa, and founded Jerusalem.

Josephus[5] maintains that this history of the strangers refers to the Hebrews, although he explains it differently from the authority on whom he relies. His views have been adopted by learned men in later times.[6]

In spite of many incongruities, which must be ascribed to anachronism or later invention,[7] Manetho's account may contain a kernel of historical truth.[8] This appears both from the linguistically-correct derivation of the name Hyksos and from the intrinsic probability of such a nomadic invasion, together with the statements of the Sallier I. Papyrus. But the Hyksos can in no case

[1] On these names and their variants in Eusebius, Africanus, and the Scholiast on Plato, see Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. p. 137 f.; Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 284.

[2] Josephus gives a second etymology of Hyksos (=prisoners of war), which he professes to derive from another copy of Manetho. On this see especially Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 285 f. As to the correct explanation of the name see *ibid.* p. 286, and also the reading Hykussos in Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* x. 13.

[3] Other figures in Jul. Afric. See Duncker, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i.[5] p. 107 f.; Meyer § 112.

[4] In Eusebius.

[5] *Contra Apion*, i. 14, 16, 26. Differently in Müller, *Joseph Geg. Ap.*, p. 120.

[6] Hengstenberg, *Die Büch. Mos. und Ägypt.*, p. 260 ff.; Seyffart, *Chronol. Sacra*, p. 24; Hofmann, *Ägypt. und Israel. Zeitrech*, p. 21 f.; Uhlemann, *Israeliten und Hyksos*, p. 74 ff.

[7] See Duncker, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i.[5] p. 107 f.; Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 287 f.

[8] See Duncker, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i.[5] p. 109 ff.; Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 287 ff.; Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch.* i. p. 227 f.; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. § 110 f.

be identified with the Hebrews. For the latter, according to their own tradition, did not enter Egypt as conquerors. And monuments discovered in modern times, which in all probability[1] belong to the second Hyksos dynasty, do not justify us in supposing that the Hyksos were Semites at all.[2] They seem rather to have either been Cushites,[3] or natives of the interior of Asia[4] (Accadians? Elamites?).

Hence it would appear preferable to suppose some connection between the Israelites and the Lepers mentioned by Manetho and many later writers.

It is to Josephus that we again owe a detailed statement.[5] The fact of his characterising it as unworthy of credence[6] is not of much account, owing to his own fixed tendency. According to him Manetho gave the following narrative: King Amenophis desired to behold the gods. A wise man, of the same name as the king,[7] promised him the fulfilment of his wish if he would first rid the land of the lepers and the unclean. The king collected all the men in Egypt who had any bodily defect, eighty thousand in number,[8] and set them to hard labour in the quarries. Subsequently he gave them what had once been the shepherd-city Avaris to dwell in. Here they elected as their leader a man who had been a priest at Heliopolis, Osarsiph by name. He gave them laws and bade them fortify Avaris and prepare for a war with Egypt. He himself set out for Jerusalem to the Hyksos and persuaded them to join him in the war. They came with two hundred thousand men. Amenophis first placed his son, Sethos, who was five years old, and also

[1] This is not certain: the Hyksos may have adapted the monuments they found. See Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. p. 133.

[2] See Wiedemann, p. 289 f.; Meyer, § 109. Note also the drawing in Ebers, *HWB.*, p. 330.

[3] Maspero, *Gesch. d. morg. Völk.*, p. 167 ff.

[4] Brugsch, *Verh. der intern. Orient-Kongr.* (Berlin, 1881) ii. 3, p. 76 ff.; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. § 137, retracted *Gesch. Äg.*, p. 206. Besides Meyer, *ut supra*, *cf.* now especially Hommel, *Gesch. Bab. und Ass.*, p. 370 (Zusammenhang der Hyksos mit dem Elamiteneinfall).

[5] *Contra Apion*, i. 26, 27.

[6] ἀδεσπότως μυθολογούμενα, *Contra Apion*, i. 16.

[7] Respecting him, see Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 385.

[8] Chaeremon says 250,000.

called Rameses after his father, in safety with the king of Ethiopia. Then he opposed the foes with three hundred thousand men. Yet he did not venture on a battle, but retired first to Memphis and then to Ethiopia. Thirteen years he remained here in exile, and during the whole of this time Egypt was in the hands of the combined Unclean and Hyksos, who cruelly ill-treated it, destroying the images of the gods, and killing the sacred animals. Osarsiph now called himself Moses. At the close of the thirteen years Amenophis returned, beat the intruders, and pursued them as far as the Syrian frontier. Manetho held that the lepers were the ancestors of the Jews.

A number of other authors, such as Chaeremon,[1] Lysimachus,[2] Hecateus of Abdera,[3] Apion himself,[4] Diodorus Siculus,[5] and others,[6] give very similar accounts of these events, differing indeed in details, but as to the main point all presenting the same type.

The majority of recent investigators have shown themselves disposed to recognise a core of historical truth, though surrounded in many respects with legendary additions, also in this narrative of a disturbance of Egypt by elements which were closely connected with Syria.[7] They have been considerably influenced by the fact that the Harris Papyrus tells of a subjugation of Egypt by a Syrian adventurer at about the same date as Manetho, in all probability, supposes the domination of the Unclean.[1]

[1] Joseph. *Contra Apion*, i. 32.

[2] Joseph. *Contra Apion*, i. 34. He names King Bocchoris, who, in any case, is of much later date. Tacitus also follows him, *Hist.* v. 3 ff.

[3] Diod. Sic. xl. 3. His description is kindlier than Manetho's and most of the rest.

[4] Joseph. *Contra Apion*, ii. 2. [5] xxxiv. 1.

[6] As to these, see Duncker, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i.[5] p. 404 ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 123 ff. (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 86).

[7] Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. p. 270, finds the historical core in the monotheistic reform of Khuenaten (Amenhoteph IV.), which Manetho, or a predecessor of his, has intentionally blended with the story of Moses and the Exodus.

[8] *Cf.* Eisenlohr, *Der grosse Papyrus Harris*, etc. (Leipzig, 1872), especially p. 13 ff. Brugsch, *Gesch. Ägypt.*, p. 589 f. (Eng. Trans ii. p. 136 f.), where also we must observe the, at any rate in part, striking similarity between this narrative and Manetho's account of the Unclean. *Cf.* also Kohler, *Bibl. Gesch.* i. p. 233.

It has also been believed[1] that when the legend represented the enemies of Egypt as unclean and leprous, this was an unmistakable allusion to the Hebrews, hostile, indeed, and distorted, but originating in the fact that they must have been religiously unclean in the eyes of the Egyptians.[2] But if the expulsion of the Unclean is to be brought into connection with the departure of the Israelites we must not blink the fact that in this case the later national Egyptian legend has not only confounded the religiously with the physically unclean, and arbitrarily recast a mass of details, but has taken a wrong view of the entire character of the antagonism. The dominion of a Syrian people over Egypt, described both in the Harris Papyrus and by Manetho, does not correspond with the Israelite tradition. The Hebrews came peacefully, not as conquerors, and were oppressed in Egypt, not oppressors. Nor did their departure result from their being expelled by force of arms. The departure of the Jews and the calamity mentioned in the Harris Papyrus may have been very nearly contemporaneous. They have probably been blended together in the later Egyptian legend, reported by Manetho, because of the plagues and the annihilation of the Egyptian army. Originally they must have been distinct events.

I would not venture to assert confidently that Manetho's account embodies an independent Egyptian reminiscence of the Exodus. But if it does, the question must then be asked as to what period of Egyptian history it is to be assigned. The names Rameses, Amenophis, Sethos-Rameses[3] appear to correspond most nearly with those of the kings Rameses II., Merenptah and Seti II., who stood to each other in the relations of father, son, and grandson. Accordingly most moderns have agreed that Rameses II. was the Pharaoh of the Oppression and Merenptah of

[1] Gen. xliii. 32; xlvi. 34.

[2] See Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* ii.[2] p. 110 ff. (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 76 ff.); Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 495, and the majority of the writers mentioned in Note 1, p. 261.

[3] More precisely, in Josephus: Rhampses, Amenophis, Sethos-Rhamesses; in Julius Africanus and Syncellus: Rhapsakes (Rhampses), Amenephthes (Men.), Rhamesses. See Lepsius, *Königsbuch. Anh.*, p. 16 f.; Ebers, *Gosen*,[2] p. 536.

the Exodus.[1] And, as a matter of fact, it is impossible to deny that by the Amenophis of Josephus, Manetho cannot have meant any one but Merenptah.[2]

Yet even if the relation between the lepers and the Hebrews is admitted, many reasons, recently advanced, tell against Merenptah. Under him Egypt's power was still at its climax, not feeble and in peril, as Manetho's account would imply.[3] And the question is settled by the fact that Merenptah died in peace at a good old age, not in war against the foreigners or whilst pursuing them.[4] And if Manetho himself wrote Amenophis, which is not likely, considering that he mentions the father and the son, this name would point to Amenhotep, not Merenptah.[5] On the other hand the state of affairs presupposed in Manetho and in the Book of Exodus reminds us much more forcibly of the circumstances which the Harris Papyrus depicts as prevailing in the time subsequent to the death of Merenptah and Seti II. The Pharaoh of the Exodus must therefore have been Amen-meses or Sa-ptah, one of the immediate predecessors of Set-nechts, the founder of the Twentieth Dynasty.[6] This points to about 1300 B.C.

But it is evident, from what has been said above, that this also is a conjecture rather than a certain result. The Egyptian accounts, so far as they are at present known, point with some degree of certainty to Rameses II. as the Pharaoh of the Oppres-

[1] Lepsius, *Chronol.*, p. 323 ff., and *PRE.*[2] i. p. 173 f.; Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, i. p. ccxii, and v. p. 133 ff.; Chabas, *Mélanges Égypt*, i. p. 43 f., and *Recherches*, p. 139 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* ii.[3] p. 110 ff. (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 76 ff.); Delitzsch, *Genes.*[4] p. 450; Duncker, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i.,[5] p. 400; Brugsch, *Gesch. Ägypt.*, p. 582 (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 128; Ebers, *Gosen*,[2] p. 78, and in *HWB.*, p. 333.

[2] The proof is that Julius Africanus and Syncellus actually give [A]menephthes in place of Amenophis. Amenophis must therefore be due to a misunderstanding on the part of Josephus, or an ancient clerical error in his copy of Manetho.

[3] Maspero, *Gesch. d. morg. Völk.*, p. 257 f; Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, pp. 477, 493. But see now Meyer, *Gesch. Äg.*, p. 287 ff., where a somewhat different picture comes out.

[4] Wiedemann, *ut supra*, p. 477. Hence he must have escaped. And this is not excluded.

[5] See Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.*, p. 271.

[6] Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 493, agrees in this with Maspero and Eisenlohr. *Cf.* Mahler, in *Zeitschr. f. Äg. Spr.*, 1890, p. 32 ff., where Rameses II. is placed in 1348-1281.

sion. The position of the Exodus in Egyptian history cannot at present be determined more nearly than is involved in saying that it occurred after the time of Rameses II. and before the beginning of the Twentieth Dynasty.

Nor can the direction of the march be fixed more precisely by means of the identifications of Biblical places thus far gained from the monuments.[1] Only one assertion can be confidently made. Brugsch's suggestion[2] that the route of the Israelites lay across the low ground of the Serbonian Lake does not correspond with the facts: and the Sea of Reeds in Exodus must still be identified with the Red Sea.[3]

[1] Against E. Naville see Dillmann, *Pithom, Hero, Klysma*, pp. 3 f., 9 f.

[2] *Report of Proceedings of the Second. Intern. Congr. of Orient.* (Lond. 1874), p. 28; *L'Exode* (Leipzig, 1875), p. 11 ff. Prior to him *cf.* Schleiden, *Landenge von Sués*, p. 191 ff.

[3] See especially Ebers, *Gosen*,[2] p. 107 ff.; Riehm, in the *HWB.*, p. 552 ff.

CHAPTER III

THE CONQUEST OF CANAAN

It is a tradition common to all our sources that Moses died before the entry of his people into the land west of the Jordan. Only after his decease did the tribes of Israel prepare to win that chief portion of the Promised Land.

The history of the conquest is related consecutively in the Book of Joshua. But here also several accounts can be distinguished. Speaking generally they are, as has already been shown, the same sources as the Pentateuch presents, but with this difference, that the ancient accounts E and J, which flow with such copiousness there, are here preserved much more sparingly. Besides which the comparatively few traces which point at all decisively to J frequently allow of the assumption that they no longer have precisely the same form as when they came from the author's pen. E is in almost the same case: of this source, too, there are only a few remnants in the Book of Joshua; subsequent inquiry must determine whether elements from it can be detected in the Book of Judges and even in Samuel.

The later accounts, into which we find these fragments interwoven, though much fuller of detail and much more considerable in extent, contribute little or no material towards our knowledge of the course of events. The material they use is that supplied by the older tradition, and they work it up afresh from their own ethical and theocratic points of view. Our information as to the events of the conquest is therefore

limited to a small number of statements of very high value but very little compass.

Happily for our knowledge of that period the Book of Judges has preserved a large section of J which contains a number of valuable notices. Our first concern is with this important constituent of the oldest tradition.

§ 26. *The Survey of the Conquest in Judges I. and II.*, 1-5.

1. *The Text.*—Although this piece of narrative[1] is externally joined to the Book of Judges it has for some time been seen that its contents require it to be connected with the Book of Joshua instead. It cannot originally have served, as now, as an introduction to the Period of the Judges. At least if it did, it was not intended to suggest that the events it mentions occurred after Joshua's death. Its title alone gave rise to some misunderstanding formerly. Take that away,[2] and there can be no doubt that we have here another narrative of what happened at the Conquest, parallel to the first part of our present Book of Joshua. Strictly speaking the fragment is a summary rather than an actual narrative. The question may therefore well be asked, whether it is not a mere extract from a detailed work which was parallel to our present Book of Joshua.[3]

We are helped in dealing with the question by the welcome fact that we still possess in our present Book of Joshua parallels to some verses of this fragment, parts of which agree verbally. Meyer and Budde have dealt with the reciprocal relations of the

[1] For a general view of the subject see Studer, *Das Buch. d. Richter*, 1835, (²1842), p. 1 ff.; Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 585, note 2; and *Einl.*⁴ p. 181 ff.; Ed. Meyer, *Kritik der Berichte über die Erob. Paläst* in *ZAW.* i. (1881), p. 117 ff.; Bertheau, *Das Buch der Richter*,² 1883, p. 1 ff.; Budde, *Richter und Josua* in *ZAW.* vii. (1887), p. 93 ff., and now *Richter und Samuel* (1890), 1 ff.

[2] Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 585, thought the words 'after the death of *Moses*' more appropriate. But it does not follow that this was the original reading. The formula is due to the editors of the book. For the rest see Bertheau, *Richt.*² p. 5 f.; Meyer, *ZAW.* i. p. 135; Wellh. *Einl.*⁴ p. 181; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 136.

[3] Decided thus by Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 585.

corresponding sections. The former[1] prefers the text of Judges throughout, and looks on the corresponding notices in Joshua as simply borrowed from it. Budde,[2] however, has, I believe, proved that the Book of Joshua, in a number of instances, has the earlier text.[3] This result enhances the probability that Judges i. is merely an extract, or, to speak more precisely, a greatly abbreviated and here and there somewhat altered reproduction, of what was once a fuller account of the Conquest of Canaan. Scanty remains of that ancient narrative have been preserved to us in the parallel verses of the Book of Joshua,[4] and it would seem that in some points, though not in all, they more nearly resemble the original form.

But neither has that extract as it now lies before us in the Book of Judges been left untouched. It has been worked over in several places by the editor's hand and accommodated to the contents of the book. Hence the title.[5]

The importance of this constituent of our oldest tradition contained in Judges i. makes it necessary in the first place to determine as far as possible the very words of this summary of the Conquest in the oldest form that can now be reached. What we have said above shows that this can only be done by the aid of the parallel text in the Book of Joshua, to which a few other fragments of that book which go together with Judges i. must be added.

'. . . And the sons[6] of Joseph spake unto Joshua, saying, Why hast thou given me but *one* lot and *one* part for an inheritance, seeing I am a numerous people, forasmuch as[7] hitherto Yahvé hath blessed me? And Joshua answered them, If thou art a numerous people, get thee up to the forest of Gilead[8] and cut

[1] *ZA W.* i., p. 134 f.; Bertheau agrees with him, p. xviii.
[2] *ZA W.* vii. p. 97 ff.; *cf.* still earlier Dillm., *NuDtJo.*, p. 442.
[3] Although this is not always the case, *e.g.*, in Josh. xv. 13; in Josh. xvii. 11, also there is a partly later text.
[4] *Cf.* Budde, *ZA W.*, p. 115 f.
[5] Judges i. 1 *a*.
[6] Perhaps originally: 'The house of Joseph'; *cf.* Dillm., *NuDtJo.*, p. 546.
[7] Read עַל־אֲשֶׁר.
[8] According to Budde, p. 125.

down there for thyself,[1] if the hill-country of Ephraim is too narrow for thee.—And the sons of Joseph said: The hill-country is not enough for us, but all the Canaanites that dwell in the land of the valley have chariots of iron, (especially) they who are in Beth-shean and her daughter-towns, and they who are in the valley of Jezreel. Joshua answered the house of Joseph:[2] Thou art a numerous people, and hast great strength: thou shalt not have one lot only. The hill-country of Gilead shall be thine,[3] for it is still forest and thou mayest cut it down and obtain the goings out thereof (=pass beyond it into the plain). For thou wilt (then) drive out the Canaanite although he has chariots of iron and is strong (Josh. xvii. 14-18[4]). . . .'

'Then the children of Israel asked of Yahvé: Who of us shall go up first against the Canaanite, to fight against him? Yahvé said: Judah shall go up; behold, I have delivered the land into his hand. But Judah said unto Simeon his brother: Come up with me into my lot, that we may fight (together) against the Canaanite; and I likewise will go with thee into thy lot. So Simeon went with him . . .[5] And they found Adoni-bezek in Bezek,[6] and fought against him and smote the Canaanite and the Perizzite.[7] But Adoni-bezek fled, and they pursued after him and

[1] The following words, 'in the land of the Perizzites and of the Rephaim' are not found in the LXX., and therefore probably are a gloss.

[2] The words 'Ephraim and Manasseh' are also to be deleted; the LXX. omits them.

[3] According to Budde, p. 125.

[4] It is quite within the bounds of possibility that the whole of this passage may be a unity. In that case the discourse is resumed at *v.* 16. This is Budde's view, p. 125 f. But it is much simpler to see in *v.* 16. the beginning of another account (*cf.* Dillm., p. 548). *V.* 14 f. will then =E, *v.* 16-18=J. Nor does this seem to me to involve such a confusion as Budde complains of. Such peculiarities of form as prove J's authorship are only found in *v.* 16 ff. At the beginning of the speech in *v.* 16 a few words must probably be supplied in a similar form to the question in *v.* 14. *Cf.* also Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 600, and Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* p. 163.

[5] In *v.* 4 the specially surprising point, besides certain expressions, is the appearance of Judah alone. I therefore prefer to follow Budde in leaving it out (*ZA W.* vii. p. 95). Possibly in place of it there stood some such words as still have been preserved: 'And Yahvé delivered the Canaanite into their hand.'

[6] As to Budde's proposal, p. 149, to read 'King of Jerusalem' instead of 'in Bezek,' see below in our examination of chap. x.

[7] Meyer, p. 135, unjustifiably strikes out *v.* 5.

caught him, and cut off his thumbs and his great toes. Then said Adoni-bezek: Threescore and ten kings,[1] having their thumbs and their great toes cut off, gleaned under my table: as I have done so God hath requited me. And they[2] brought him to Jerusalem and he died there (Judges i. 1*b*-3, 5-7). And Yahvé was with Judah, and he conquered the hill-country. But he could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, for they had chariots of iron. Neither could[3] the sons of Judah[4] drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem, and the Jebusites dwelt amongst them in Jerusalem unto this day' (Judges i. 19, 21;[5] Josh. xv. 63).

'But unto Caleb the son of Kenaz[6] he (Joshua) gave an inheritance among the sons of Judah, even Hebron, as Moses[7] had commanded. And Caleb[8] went against the Canaanites that dwelt in Hebron. Now the name of Hebron beforetime was Kiriath-arba. And Caleb smote (drave out?) the three sons of the giants, Sheshai, Ahiman, and Talmai. From thence he went up[9] against the inhabitants of Debir. Now the name of Debir beforetime was Kiriath-sepher. And Caleb said: He that smiteth Kiriath-sepher and taketh it, to him will I give Achsah my daughter to wife. Othniel, the son of Kenaz, Caleb's[10] younger[11] brother, took it:

[1] Possibly we ought to read שבעה, *seven*.

[2] Naturally 'they' are his own people: so think Reuss, Cassel, Budde, p. 95 f. The ancient misunderstanding which made Judah the subject of the sentence led the reviser to add *v.* 8, in entire dissonance with *v.* 21. *V.* 9 also (ירד) may have originated in connection therewith and from the same hand.

[3] Budde, p. 99, in accordance with Josh. xv. 63. There is still a remnant of the cancelled idea in the לא הוריש of *v.* 19.

[4] Instead of Benjamin, according to Josh. xv. 63.

[5] The insertion of these two verses here, as well as that of *v.* 20, and their transposition, is required by Josh. xv. 13 ff. See Meyer, p. 137; Budde, p. 97 ff.

[6] 'Son of Jephunneh,' Josh. xv. 13, can hardly be original. J appears to have a different tradition respecting Caleb's father.

[7] Judges i. 20 is at this point nearer the original than Josh. xv. 13. We have tried above to make out the original text from this verse and from Judges i. 10, 20.

[8] According to the context he must be put in place of Judah at Judges i. 10. The alteration there is due to the misplacement of the verse which mentions Caleb.

[9] Follow Hollenberg, *ZAW.* i. p. 101, in reading ויעל, Judges i. 11.

[10] The only way of understanding the passage. See Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 523.

[11] Omitted in Josh. xv. 17.

then Caleb gave him his daughter Achsah to wife. And when Achsah was brought unto him she moved him (Othniel) to ask of her father a field.[1] She lighted down from off her ass, and Caleb said unto her: What wouldest thou? She said unto him: Give me yet a blessing; for seeing thou hast set me in a dry (southern) land, give me springs of water! Then he gave her springs in the high land and in the low.' (Josh. xv. 13, 14 = Judges i. 20 and part of 10; Judges i. 11-15 = Josh. xv. 15-19).

'And the sons of Hobab[2] the Kenite, the father-in-law of Moses, went up from the city of palms[3] to the sons of Judah in the wilderness of Judah which lieth on the slope[4] of Arad.[5] And they rose up and dwelt[6] with the Amalekites.[7] And Judah went with Simeon his brother, and they smote the Canaanites that inhabited Zephath[8] and devoted it to destruction, and he called the name of the place Hormah. And the territory of the Edomites[9] reached from the ascent of Akrabbim to Petra[10] and beyond.' (Judges i. 16, 17, 36).

'And the sons[11] of Joseph, for their part, went up against

[1] At Judges i. 14, read שדה, with the LXX. in Joshua.

[2] Read בני הקיני. The name, no doubt, has fallen out. In spite of Judges iv. 11, where קין is 'the Kenite clan,' Meyer's proposal (*ZAW.* i. p. 137, adopted by Budde, *ZAW.* vii. p. 152) that we should read 'Cain, the father-in-law of Moses,' is proved impossible by the fact that the father-in-law of Moses is nowhere else called Cain: according to Num. x. 29 (J) Hobab is the only one of the two names contained in the LXX. that can have stood here. Judges iv. 11 establishes this.

[3] Our ignorance respecting the decision arrived at by Hobab (Num. x. 29 ff.) makes it uncertain whether Jericho is here meant. A Tamar in the south might be intended (see Bertheau on the passage). In that case, however, אל-בני must be read. But the probabilities are in favour of Jericho.

[4] According to the reading במורד, which van Doorninck and Budde (p. 102) follow. *Cf.* LXX. (Luc.) ἐπὶ καταβάσεως Ἀράδ.

[5] There is no reason for substituting Zephath (Meyer, p. 137).

[6] Either the verbs must be read in the plural or the clan name Kenite has here dropped out. [7] This is Hollenberg's view, *ZAW.* i. p. 102.

[8] It is not necessary to read Arad instead (Meyer, pp. 132, 137). See above on § 14.

[9] According to Hollenberg, *ZAW.* i. p. 104, and, more precisely, Budde, *ZAW.* vii. p. 109.

[10] הסלע, Budde, p. 110. See *ibid.* with respect to the misplacement of this verse.

[11] Read בני *Cf.* Bertheau, p. 35.

Bethel. Joshua[1] was with them. And the sons of Joseph sent to spy out Bethel. Now the name of the city beforetime was Luz. Then the watchers saw a man come forth out of the city. They said unto him: Shew us now the entrance into the city, and we will deal kindly with thee. He shewed them the entrance into the city. And they smote the city with the edge of the sword, and they let the man go and all his family. The man went into the land of the Hittites, and built a city, and called its name Luz; which is the name thereof unto this day . . .' (Judges i. 22-26.)

'But the sons of Israel drave not out the Geshurites, and the Maachathites; and the Geshurite and the Maachathite dwell in Israel unto this day.[2] And Manasseh was not able[3] to take Beth-shean, Taanach, Dor, Ibleam, Megiddo, and their daughter-towns. The Canaanites therefore would dwell in that land. But when the sons of Israel waxed strong they reduced the Canaanites to serfdom, but did not drive them out (Judges i. 27f. = Joshua xvii. 11-13)[4]. Ephraim was not able to drive out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer; but the Canaanites dwelt in the midst of Ephraim unto this day, and became tributary.[5] Zebulun was not able to drive out the inhabitants of Kitron and of Nahalol; but the Canaanites dwelt among them, and became tributary. Asher was not able to drive out the inhabitants of Accho, Zidon, Ahlab, Achzib, Helbah, Aphik, and Rehob. But Asher dwelt among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of that land, for they were

[1] Budde, p. 144, proposes to follow the LXX. (Luc.) in reading יהודה in place of יהוה, and regarding it as a substitution for יהושע. This appears arbitrary, but seems to me to be well-grounded. If the reading of the LXX. did not stand in the text it is inexplicable. And on the other hand we have abundant evidence that the reviser was disposed to insert the name of Judah in Judges i.

[2] As to this verse (Josh. xiii. 13), belonging to our context, see Budde, p. 117 f.

[3] לא יכלו in Joshua (xvii. 12) seems to be another instance of a more original text.

[4] On the relation between the two texts see Bertheau, *Richter*,[2] p. 37 ff.; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 544 f.; Budde, *ZAW.* vii. p. 104 f. On the whole, the original text has here been best preserved in Judges. The absence of certain town-names from the LXX. (Vat.) perhaps corresponds to the primary state of the text of Joshua (Bertheau, Budde), or may be due to intentional curtailment (Dillm.).

[5] Supplied from Josh. xvi. 10.

not able to drive them out. Naphtali could not drive out the inhabitants of Beth-shemesh and of Beth-anath, but dwelt among the Canaanites, and these became tributary.' (Judges i. 29 = Josh. xv. 10; Judges i. 30-33.)

'And the Amorites forced the sons of Dan into the hill country, and would not suffer them to come down to the valley.[1] Thus did they make their inheritance too strait for them.[2] Then the sons of Dan went up and fought against Leshem,[3] and took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and possessed it and dwelt therein, and called Leshem Dan, after the name of Dan their father. Thus the Amorites would dwell in Har-heres, Aijalon, and Shaalbim. But when the hand of the house of Joseph lay heavy (LXX., upon them) they became tributary' (Judges i. 34[4] + Josh. xix. 47*a* [= Josh. xix. 47*b* of the LXX., according to which text[5] it is partly to be restored]; Josh. xix. 47*b*; Judges i. 35).

'And the angel of Yahvé came up from Gilgal to Bethel to the house of Israel.[6] And they sacrificed there unto Yahvé' (ii. 1*a*, 5*b*).

2. *The Division of the Land, and Joshua.*—The first glance at the whole account in this piece enables us to see that its thread does not run on unbroken. At several points it is cut off, and some art is needed to restore it. Yet it is plain that the now dislocated members are parts of what was once a well-arranged whole.

[1] We must read with Budde, according to the LXX. of Josh. xix. 47, *καὶ οὐκ εἶων αὐτούς*, ולא נתנום.

[2] See Budde, p. 120. The LXX. continues as follows: *ἔθλιψαν ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὸ ὅριον τῆς μερίδος*. I believe Budde is right in thinking that this (in Heb. ויציקו מהם גבול נחלתם), lies at the foundation of the peculiar Masoretic reading (Josh. xix. 47*a*) ויצא גבול בני דן מהם.

[3] Possibly Wellh. *De Gent. Jud.*, p. 37, is right in pronouncing it Leshām.

[4] Meyer wrongly objects to *vv.* 34-36. האמרי, *v.* 34, may have been his chief reason.

[5] On the relation between the two texts, see especially Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 567, and Budde, *ZA W.* vii. p. 119 ff. The LXX. obviously keeps an older and more complete text in Josh. xix. 47 f., from which the MT of the Joshua and Judges passages is in each case peculiarly abbreviated.

[6] So Budde, p. 166, partially after the LXX. Possibly we might also think of Shiloh, on account of Josh. xviii. 1. At all events J here, like P at xviii. 1, appears still to preserve a recollection that prior to David the Ark of the Covenant was not in Judah. Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 169, ascribes *vv.* 1 and 5 to E.

Not only do they all contain the same linguistic marks[1] and, without exception, justify the inference that J was the author, but they are also all controlled by one consentient line of thought, and point thus to a definite idea as to how Canaan was conquered, which, in any case, established itself at a very early date in Israelite tradition.

If we have arranged the fragments correctly, the fundamental idea is that the country was apportioned to the various tribes before they set about the conquest. According to the meaning of the whole summary, it does not seem to have been left to accident to determine what possessions the several tribes should obtain in Canaan. On the contrary, an agreement is arrived at and a certain district given to each tribe as its lot. This regulation assumes that the people are divided into tribes. We are not told when that division was effected. It is taken for granted as being practically complete. The individual clans are regarded as sufficiently welded together internally to stand for the most part by themselves and independently take possession of their territories, although they feel themselves members of the whole body. This idea comes out very distinctly; each tribe, so far as their proceedings are here described, acts for itself. If an exception occurs it is expressly mentioned; Judah joins with Simeon; the house of Joseph sets to work unitedly. We are told concerning almost all the tribes here named what the districts were which they could not conquer: from this it is to be inferred that the narrator supposes the conquest of their tribal territory to be their own special business, not that of united Israel, and doubtless that he related the steps they actually took to win their territories.

This necessarily gives rise to the question: Is not the idea of such a preliminary partition of the land in contradiction with the idea of its having been subsequently conquered by the tribes separately? Can one and the same author have narrated both? At first sight one is inclined to reply that the very fact of the conquest having

[1] Besides Meyer, *ZA W.* i. p. 138, see especially Budde, *ZA W.* vii. p. 97 ff., in several places.

been made in sections, which comes out as a trustworthy historical reminiscence, precludes the possibility of there having been a previous partition. For if the tribes were sufficiently united to agree on the partition of the country, prudence and duty would have recommended common action in conquering it rather than the leaving each tribe to look after itself. This leads us to suspect that the preparatory partition belongs to an artificial system; while the other idea is recommended by its accordance with the natural order of events. Hence the actual course of events might be supposed to run as follows: as time went on, one tribe after another crossed the Jordan; each won for itself the territory which attracted it or which was brought within its grasp by favouring circumstances: thus it came about that, after the lapse of a considerable time, all the tribes by degrees established themselves, at all events in the hill-country of the land west of the Jordan. No preliminary partition seems requisite. In fact, it seems unnatural, supported by few historical analogies, and therefore bearing on its face the tokens of later invention.

Two circumstances appear to me to remove the suspicion which undoubtedly attaches to a previous partition. First, there are the traces of an actual joint operation of the tribes which can be found, in any case, before the partition, but also afterwards as well. Secondly, there is Joshua's leadership of all Israel, at least up to a certain point. From Judges i. onwards Israel falls into two main groups in our narratives. Judah and Simeon have an independent existence. Beside them is the house of Joseph and the rest of the tribes attached to it, that is, substantially the northern tribes. We should not be justified in supposing that this twofold division is a mere reflex of the state of affairs in the post-Solomonic period. On the contrary, the marked difference between the tribes of Joseph and the house of Judah is as old as Israel itself. It is reflected in the entire history, and the separation under Jeroboam is not its cause, but merely one of its effects. Within this division, however, the presence of something in common is unmistakable. Not only does Judah go along with

Simeon, but the house of Joseph also advances, at first with united front, and it is only as time passes that the tribes separate. The manner in which our author, whilst using the collective designation, 'House of Joseph,'[1] perfectly well manages to bring out the distinction between Ephraim and Manasseh,[2] is specially significant. In the one case, the two leading tribes act in common; in the other, each stands for itself. But if they work in concert we may at once assume that the smaller brother-tribes joined them, in fact that the title, House of Joseph, was to some extent a name for the northern tribes in general, the subsequent Kingdom of Israel. This is still evident from the survival of the title, Sons of Israel,[3] in a single place belonging to this passage.

Hence it is clear that the tradition respecting the conquest of Canaan must have known of something besides the independent action of the several tribes. Together with Judah's advance, in alliance with Joseph, it must have been acquainted with a common movement of the Joseph-tribes, *i.e.* of the main portion of Israel. The two-fold indications of the tradition may be brought into agreement by the assumption that until a certain goal was reached the northern tribes acted in concert, but that afterwards, when the main work was done, each was left to act for itself.

If we are right in looking upon this as J's account of the course of events, we have found, both for J and for the actual course of things, the fulfilment of the condition implied in a preliminary partition.[4] The separate advance of the various tribes can then no longer be adduced against this supposition. For this was not made to such an extent as at first sight appears. And in no case was this the only point with which the tradition was conversant. Our theory is essentially confirmed by the clear

[1] Judges i. 27 f. (=Josh. xvii. 11 ff.), *v.* 29 (=Josh. xvi. 10).

[2] Judges i. 22; Josh. xvii. 14. [3] Josh. xiii. 13.

[4] At most the only question which can arise is whether J, as we shall afterwards see was the case with E, in the first instance mentioned only the assignment of territory to Judah-Simeon, and Joseph, bringing in the other tribes afterwards. On this see below, § 29.

glimpses which the sources afford of Joshua's single leadership of united Israel.

In recent times it has been believed by several writers that Joshua cannot be looked on as a historical person. He has seemed to be merely the legendary reflection of the brilliant figure of the great Moses. If the legend so moulded to its will the Conquest of Canaan as here also to substitute in place of the actual course of events a picture of an unnatural cohesion of the tribes, painted after the model of the Mosaic times, this combination would need embodying in a commander, filled with the spirit of Moses, and bringing to a close, in his way, the work that he had begun. The idea that the source J did not know Joshua,[1] and described the conquest of the land without reference to him, seemed to furnish a specially welcome confirmation of this setting aside of Joshua. When it was observed, on the other hand, that E, the Ephraimite source, frequently mentioned Joshua and actually still knew of his sepulchre in Mount Ephraim, there seemed to be sufficient ground for the conclusion that Joshua, instead of being a person, was an Ephraimite clan whose eponymous tribal hero was thought to be buried in Timnath-serah.[2]

The validity of this line of argument is impugned in the first place by the fact that Joshua is found in J as well as in E; this has been dwelt on by Kuenen,[3] then by Dillmann,[4] and again, most recently, by Budde.[5] As a matter of fact there can hardly be any doubt about it. The opposite view has derived considerable support from the fact that whilst Joshua undoubtedly appears in J his name is entirely absent from Judges i. But his omission here is only too naturally explained by the necessity of setting him aside if the narrative were to find a place in the Book of Judges. The opening words of the book, 'after the death of Joshua,' which are confidently recognised as an editorial addition, put an end to

[1] Meyer, *ut supra*, p. 134; and earlier, Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 585; moreover, Stade, *ZAW.* i. p. 147; *Gesch. Isr.* i. pp. 135, 161.

[2] Meyer, *ut supra*, p. 143, note 2.

[3] *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 14.

[4] In several passages of the Commentary on *NuDtJo.*

[5] *ZAW.* vii. p. 130 f.

all doubt. On the other hand, as Budde[1] has rightly remarked, the Summary which we have reproduced above opens with the question, 'Who shall begin the fight?' and the territory of each tribe is called its 'lot'; two facts which clearly enough presuppose a previous common agreement, this, in its turn, implying union under a single leader. Judges i. cannot in any case be the beginning of an independent story; it necessarily points back to an earlier one. Of that earlier one we have found at least a remnant in the Book of Joshua. But that remnant is closely connected with the person of Joshua: as soon as we follow the threads of the narrative outside the Book of Judges where his name was *necessarily* expunged, Joshua spontaneously appears at the head—a clear token that the tradition of J knew him very well.

3. *Result.*—The main points in the progress of the conquest, as related in our Summary, are thus brought out.

Whilst Moses was still their leader, the children of Israel won the territory east of the Jordan, at least in its southern half. The tribes of Reuben and Gad settle there, and consequently are not mentioned again in the Summary. The mass of the nation cross the Jordan near the Dead Sea at Gilgal. This is done under the chieftainship of the Ephraimite Joshua,[2] who undertook the leadership of Israel after the death of Moses. Gilgal is the base from which the attack on the country west of the Jordan is made; in fact it continues to be the stationary camp of the people: the angel of the Lord and the ark of the covenant remain here until they advance to Bethel after it is conquered. They probably continue for a while to return to their great cantonment at Gilgal after each achievement. At any rate till the conquest of Jericho the tribes advance together.

Now that they have obtained a firm footing in the west country they separate into the two divisions of related tribes, Judah and Joseph, each taking with it its dependent tribes and clans. But previously to this a definite district in the land now to be con-

[1] *ut supra*, pp. 96, 128 f.

[2] Josh. xvii. (14 f.) 16 ff.; Judges i. 22, if it is right to read his name there. See above, p. 269.

quered is assigned, at any rate to the leading tribes and probably to all, under the leadership of Joshua.

Judah, accompanied by Simeon, the tribe whose territory brings it into close association with him, advances first at Yahvé's behest, conquers a Canaanite paramount king, Adoni-bezek, and establishes himself in the hill-country of Judah. The Judæan chieftain Caleb, who sprang from the clan of Kenaz which had become blended with Judah, receives the ancient fortress Kiriath-arba, in reward for his services during the Desert March. He subdues the gigantic inhabitants and calls the city Hebron. Othniel, another district-chief of Judæo-Kenizzite origin, who is designated Caleb's (younger) brother, conquers Debir in the south of Judah and becomes Caleb's son-in-law. Judah is also joined by the Bedouin tribe of the Kenites which came from the peninsula of Sinai and was closely allied with Israel through Moses. Either it had joined Israel in general, crossed the Jordan with them, then, after the conquest of Jericho and the speedily ensuing separation of Judah from the bulk of the tribes, accompanied that tribe to the south; or else, after Israel's departure from the Sinai district, it may have waited a while in the Desert, then, to establish a junction with Israel, moved gradually northwards, and now have joined hands with Judah from the Negeb. In the Wilderness of Judah it continued its Bedouin mode of life. Simeon, also helped by Judah, establishes itself south of Judah, having the Kenite and Amalekite Bedouins on its boundaries, and probably in several places actually dwelling amongst them. The pass of Safâ, called in Judges the Ascent of Akrabbim, was looked upon as the southern boundary between Edom and the Promised Land.

Judah turns southwards from Jericho; the tribes of Joseph northwards. The Ephraimite leader Joshua attaches himself to the latter. Not that our sources mean us to take him as a mere tribal hero[1] belonging to Ephraim. The fragment already given of an apportionment of territory by Joshua[2] undoubtedly proceeds

[1] Kuenen, *ut supra*, is inclined to do this; *cf.* already Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 585. For the rest, see more below, p. 279 ff.

[2] Josh. xvii. 14 ff.

on the assumption that the leader determined the abode of the other families in the same manner as he appointed their lot to the house of Joseph.

Nor do we ever find envy or tribal discord assigned as the reason why Judah advanced separately and apart from Joshua's leadership. The course things took is rather thought of as the natural one under the circumstances. If the tribes advanced from the Jordan their roads must diverge at Jericho. Judah, with Simeon, and the certainly not insignificant under-tribes of the Kenites and the Kenizzites, could very well maintain the contest with the southern Canaanites, as soon as Joshua and his followers had cut off the approach of enemies from the north. But this also implies that at least in this tradition there is no support for the theory that Judah invaded the land from the south.[1] The separation at Jericho points to a previous crossing of the Jordan by all the tribes together.

The taking of Bethel, which was facilitated by the treason of one of its citizens, must certainly be regarded as the work of the united tribes of Joseph under Joshua's leadership.

Here our Summary breaks off. The editor's task was to supply the connecting link between the Books of Joshua and Judges. Hence he is no longer occupied with the successes, but with the failures which explain the circumstances of the period of the Judges. But assuredly J's narrative once told of Joshua's other feats of arms at the head of the combined tribes, as well as of the taking of Bethel, and also related the successes of the individual tribes.[2] We have already shown that traces remain of a fuller form of his narrative than Judges i. contains. Our next business will be to follow it, or elements allied to it, yet further. If it should turn out that other successes were gained by united Israel —not including Judah and Simeon—this would justify us in taking it as a confirmation of the view indicated above. That is

[1] Budde, p. 129, appears inclined to join Kuenen and others in holding this view, although he admits that J's tradition points to a united passage over the river near Jericho.

[2] See Budde, *ZA W.* vii. pp. 104, 128; Bertheau, *Richter*,[2] pp. xxviii, 2 f.

to say, Joshua, at the head of the combined Joseph tribes, to which the smaller northern tribes had attached themselves, carried out the conquest up to a certain point. Then he left each tribe to itself and remained at the head of Ephraim alone, the chief of the Joseph tribes. We cannot fix provisionally on a fitter point for Joshua's thus confining himself to Ephraim than the conquest of the hill-country of Ephraim.

§ 27. *The Conquest of Canaan until the Alliance with Gibeon, according to the Book of Joshua.*

The expectation is fulfilled. A number of sections in the Book of Joshua carry on the threads which have been started in the Summary, and that in such a way as to make them fit into and fill up the spaces there left vacant. It is desirable in each case to fix our attention first of all on such of the pieces as are more nearly related to Judges i., and must therefore be ascribed to J. In this way we shall best bring out their connection with the Summary with which we are acquainted.

It is true that a literary question immediately arises. Assuming that Judges i. is a piece which almost in every point bears the character of an excerpt, and must, as a matter of fact, be looked on as an extract from a larger narrative; assuming, too, that several passages in Joshua resemble Judges i. in this respect,[1] and therefore are to be attached to that chapter; then the question is whether the J-elements of the Book of Joshua which are now before us are of the same kind. As to their mode of telling the story, although they are for the most part brief accounts, preserved only in fragmentary form, they do not seem to bear the character of mere excerpts. We shall therefore be obliged to hold them to be parallels to Judges i., rather than direct continuations of it, belonging, perhaps, to the original work from which the still extant extract in Judges i. was taken. Intrinsically, however, they would admit of our thinking them to be a later edition of it.

[1] With reference to an undeniable difference, see above, pp. 265, 269f.

1. *Joshua at the head of All Israel.*—Judges i. sanctions the idea that Joshua was here thought of as crossing the Jordan at the head of the whole people and pressing on from Gilgal against Jericho and the hill-country. This view is raised to a certainty by the first chapters of Joshua. They give us a series of accounts, partly standing in close connection with Judges i., partly independent of that summary, in which the events happen after the manner indicated there. The Deuteronomistic revision has partly enlarged and partly somewhat modified these older accounts, but without entirely obliterating their original character.

An Introduction,[1] Deuteronomistic in character, prefaces the crossing of the Jordan and the struggle for the Promised Land. It has perhaps made use of a few older elements,[2] but on the whole it is freely worked into the context by[3] D^2. As a rhetorical and hortatory introduction we can make no use of it for our purpose. And the narrative of the spying out of Jericho which is attached to it must also be passed over provisionally.[4] It is closely connected with the history of the conquest of that city.

The first leading event we are confronted with is the crossing of the Jordan.[5] Wellhausen has distinguished two ancient accounts of it,[6] which in all probability must be recognised as the narratives of E and J. The main idea in his analysis holds good even if the division be made somewhat differently.[7]

The course of the narrative in J may be restored somewhat as follows:—From Shittim, where the people had lain some time, Joshua advances towards the Jordan.[8] Here he leads the people to expect Yahvé's miraculous help on the morrow.[9] Then he gives them the sign by which they may know the omnipotence of Yahvé; the ark of Yahvé, the Lord of the Earth, shall go before

[1] Josh. i. On this and the following see now also Albers, *Die Quellenberichte in Jos.* i.-xii. (1891).

[2] This might be discussed with reference to *vv.* 1, 2, 10, 11.

[3] See Hollenberg, *StKr.*, 1874, p. 473; Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 586; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 26.

[4] Chap. ii.

[5] Chaps. iii. and iv.

[6] *JDTh.* xxi. p. 586 ff.

[7] *Cf.* also Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 450 ff.

[8] Josh. iii. 1*abβ*; *cf.* Num. xxv. 1=J.

[9] Josh. iii. 5; *cf.* Num. xi. 18 (Exod. xix. 22?)=J.

them, and when the feet of the priests that bear it stand in the water, the waters shall be cut off and stand in a heap. This comes to pass. When the people are ready to cross the Jordan, and the priests bearing the ark touch the water, the waters that are flowing down stand still and the rest run off. The priests remain with the ark in the midst of the bed of the river until all the people have passed through.[1] When this is done Joshua is ordered to take twelve stones from the place where the priests had stood in the Jordan and put them in the quarters where they are to lodge next night, to be signs amongst them.[2]

The account in E is briefer. Joshua removes to the Jordan with all Israel early in the morning (from Shittim ?). Here he assembles the sons of Israel around him that they may hear Yahvé's command.[3] They are to choose twelve men who shall go before the ark into the midst of the bed of the Jordan. Each of them shall carry thence a stone upon his shoulder for an everlasting memorial unto the sons of Israel. The crossing is then accomplished: the moment the men that bear the ark come to the Jordan and their feet touch the water it recedes.[4] . . .

The greater simplicity of the second account, its vividness of description, and the greater intrinsic probability of the signs having been set up in the midst of the stream rather than on the bank (as a memorial of the passage), mark it out as being very likely the older of the two.[5] The statements which follow, or are inter-

[1] Josh. iii. 10*a* (10*b* is an addition by D^2), 11 (instead of הברית read יהוה, Wellh., p. 587), 13 f. (at end of *v.* 14 delete הברית), 15*b*, 16 f.

[2] Josh. iv. 1*a* (Dillm. E), 1*b*, 3 (from שאו), 6*a* (because of קרבכם, which suits a memorial set up on the land better), 8.

[3] Josh. iii. 1*aaγ*, 9 (in J the verse is superfluous and confusing; *cf.* also the first words with those in *v.* 5).

[4] Josh. iii. 12; iv. 5, 7*b*; iii. 18*a* (ורגליהם נטבלו). This transposition is recommended by the fact that iv. 5 necessarily belongs to the time *prior* to the crossing. *V.* 4, like *v.* 2, then becomes superfluous; it was introduced by R^d in order to restore the connection of the misplaced parts. *Vv.* 6*b* and 7*a* also belong to R^d, or rather to D^2, for והיו in 7*b* should immediately follow *v.* 5. Chap. iv. 9 is a fresh beginning, and does not belong to either of the two main narratives.

[5] Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 8, No. 20, ascribes it to J, but with a widely different division.

woven, come partly[1] from P, partly[2] from D^2, and probably in part from R^d, but they do not add to our knowledge of what happened. They contribute no new features, but expand E here and J there, or bring the two into harmony. We probably owe to J the notice that the monument of stones was called Gilgal.[3]

If these are the facts, they prove that the oldest nucleus of a narrative immediately following that of the passage of the Jordan belongs at least in part to E. This narrative gives a totally different explanation of the place-name Gilgal, which was of such importance in that first period in Canaan. Hollenberg[4] makes the nucleus of the narrative to be as follows: 'At that time Yahvé said unto Joshua, Make thee knives of flint, and circumcise[5] the sons of Israel. Then Joshua made him knives of flint, and circumcised the sons of Israel at the Hill of the Foreskins. And when all the people had been circumcised, they remained in the camp till they were whole. And Yahvé said unto Joshua, This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you. And he called the name of the place Gilgal, unto this day.'[6]

The narrative is usually regarded as homogeneous; hence, for the above-named and other reasons, Dillmann ascribes it entirely to E. But it is not so. The double title of the place of circumcision, Hill of the Foreskins and Gilgal, compels this conclusion. Probably therefore we have here another instance of E describing the same event as J with minor differences.[7]

This is another of the narratives which R^d has subjected to

[1] Possibly in iv. 9, 15-17, 19.

[2] Besides the passages already mentioned, especially iii. 2-4, 6-8, and the main substance of what begins at iv. 10.

[3] iv. 20; but on account of הקים the source of iv. 9 may be used here.

[4] *StKr.*, 1874, p. 493 f.

[5] וישוב and שנית are probably to be struck out, with the LXX. (Vat. and Luc.)

[6] Josh. v. 2 f., 8 f.

[7] v. 2 f., 8 (*cf.* 8*a* with iii. 17*b*; iv. 1*a* [Dillmann wrongly ascribes the latter to E]), probably belonged to J. On the other hand *v.* 9 has an etymology in E's fashion; its contents suit him, for he, at all events, cannot have derived the name Gilgal from the heap of stones.

considerable revision.[1] His chief object was to harmonise the statement here made that Israel was circumcised on its immigration into Canaan with P's assertion that Abraham adopted circumcision for himself and his posterity. The reviser has also placed here a short notice from P concerning the celebration of the Passover in Gilgal.[2] And if we might take Gilgal instead of Jericho as the scene of the man's making himself known to Joshua[3] as captain of Yahvé's host—a notice derived from E—this would be the very place where the story should stand. If the occurrence belongs to Jericho, it would stand better in a later place.

The attack on the Canaanites must follow the passage of the Jordan. If the crossing was effected at Shittim, or at all events near the mouth of the Jordan, Jericho was the first obstacle in the way of a further advance. It was the key of the country. The next event is the taking of Jericho.[4]

The narrative of this rests almost entirely on an ancient foundation, and is given in two accounts, each complete in itself, which Wellhausen[5] has disentangled with almost exhaustive thoroughness. J's narrative is here the simpler. Yahvé commands Joshua to make Israel go round the city once a day for six days (in silence), but on the seventh day seven times (with a loud battle-cry): they shall then be able to force the city. Joshua accordingly gives the people instructions for going round: 'Shout not, and let not your voice be heard, neither let any word proceed from your mouth until the day I bid you: then shall ye raise the battle-cry.' Thus did they compass the city once, and returned into the camp for the night.[6] The same is done on the next day and for six days in succession. On the seventh day they go

[1] *V.* 4-7, and probably *v.* 1, belong to him. Yet we might here think also of D^2. [2] Josh. v. 10-12.

[3] Josh. v. 13-15; *cf.* Exod. iii. 5=E. [4] Josh. vi. [5] *JDTh.* xxi. p. 589 f.

[6] Josh. vi. 3 (the words bracketed above must have stood in the text and were removed by R^d), 4*aβ* (Dillmann, *in loc.*, is possibly right in assigning this to R), 5*bβ* (most critics assign it to the other account, but עלה, here and at *v.* 20, does not agree properly with the fallen walls), 10, 11 (where ויסבו את העיר is to be read).

round the city in the same way (seven times?). Now, at last, Joshua bids them raise the battle-cry. Thus do they force their way into the city and take it.[1]

E's description of the proceedings is considerably more complicated, and therefore probably later. In it Israel is represented as going round the city seven times in *one* day, the vanguard first, next the priests with the ark, then the army. On the seventh time, the priests blow the trumpets of rams' horns, whereupon the people raise the war-cry, and the walls fall down.[2] The kernel of this version lies in the words: 'And Joshua rose early in the morning, and the priests bare the ark of Yahvé. And seven priests bare seven trumpets of rams' horns before the ark of Yahvé, and the armed men went before them, and the rearguard followed the ark of Yahvé. And at the seventh time the priests blew with the trumpets, and when the people heard the sound of the trumpet, they raised a loud battle-cry, so that the walls fell down.'[3]

With what is now chap. vi. is closely connected, on the one hand the narrative of the sending the spies to Jericho, and their preservation by the harlot Rahab,[4] and on the other, that of Achan's theft,[5] the former preceding, the latter following it. Especially in the case of the first narrative it is quite credible that it was connected with one of the two ancient accounts. If so, it must have originated with J, and there are many indications in favour of this in the piece itself.[6] In the story of Achan also many signs

[1] Josh. vi. 14, 15*a*, 16*b*, 20*a*, 20*bβ* (beginning at יעל; see the preceding note). These verses contain the minimum. Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 462, agrees. Wellhausen adds 17*a*, 19, 21, 24; Budde, *ZAW.* vii. p. 141, probably correctly, adds *v.* 26. It depends on chap. ii. whether the reference to Rahab in *v.* 17 and *v.* 22 also belong to J. I hold it not impossible.

[2] Josh. vi. 4*aab*, 5*aba*, 6, 7-9, 12 f., 16*a*, 20*ba*.

[3] *Vv.* 12, 13*aab* (*aβ* is a mistaken addition, as are also the three last words of the verse), 16*a*, 20*ba*.

[4] Chap. ii.

[5] Chap. vii.

[6] *Cf.* the easy and not prolix style of the narrative; also שמטים, *v.* 1, עשה חסד ואמת *v.* 14, האשה (without name) and האנשים, *v.* 3, 4, 5, etc., as frequently in J, *e.g.* Gen. xviii. 2, 16; xix. 12; xxxiv. 7, and xxiv. 21, 26, 30, 61; xxxvii. 15, 16. Dillmann thinks of E along with J; *v.* 10 f. at all events shows that something is due to R[d].

of J could be adduced, but R^d seems to have expanded the narrative considerably.

Two leading events, presupposed in the Summary, Judges i., but not narrated there, have now been related. The Passage of the Jordan has been effected, and Jericho, which must protect the rear whilst an advance is made on the country beyond, has been taken. At Jericho the roads diverge. One runs north-west through the Wady Matjâ to the hill-country of Ephraim, towards Ai and Bethel; the other south-west to Jerusalem and the hill country of Judah. Until now Joshua has been the leader of the entire nation that crossed the Jordan. The idea of dividing into two main columns may now have occurred to the tribes, which had not yet coalesced into a solid national unity. Before carrying it out they decide under Joshua's superintendence what portions of the country each tribe is to possess.

Thus do the facts we have now ascertained follow without difficulty those we ascertained previously. The Passage of the Jordan and the conquest of Jericho form the necessary presupposition to that partition of the country which stands at the head of our above-mentioned Summary, and must have preceded the partition in point of time. It is scarcely possible to ascertain how long Israel stayed in the fortified camp at Gilgal after crossing the Jordan: nevertheless it does not appear to be conceived of as a very short time. Judah, with Simeon, is the first to leave the common cantonment. Next, probably some time later, the sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, set out for the hill-country of Ephraim. The camp in Gilgal is still retained as a place of retreat. This solves the question as to what became of the other tribes. The presumption in any case is that they pursued their way across the hill-country of Ephraim which had yet to be conquered; that is, they attached themselves provisionally to Joseph and Joshua.

We have thus reached afresh the junction with the Book of Joshua. The continuation of its narrative must be regarded as a description of the success of Joshua at the head of the house of

Joseph and the tribes provisionally attached to it. The fortunes of Judah are for the present left unnoticed.

2. *Joshua at the head of the House of Joseph.*—The road to the hill-country through the Wady Matjâ is barred by the Canaanite royal city Ai. Joshua's first object is to conquer it. This also is told in a double narrative, as Knobel and Schrader saw, and Wellhausen[1] afterwards still more precisely. The correct analysis has recently been carried out by Dillmann.[2]

J's narrative presupposes[3] an earlier unsuccessful attempt on Ai, and thus comes into connection with elements of chap. vii. Joshua marches against Ai afresh. Arriving in front of it he despatches[4] from his position by night three thousand (?) men,[5] with orders to lie in ambush behind the city. Himself with the army will attack the city; if the enemy come out against him, as they did before, he will feign flight; during the pursuit the ambush are to take possession of the city, which has been left by its defenders, and set it on fire. In accordance with this command the ambush takes up a position overnight between Bethel and Ai. Van der Velde[6] says that opportunities of concealment are supplied by two rocky hills between Tell el-Hajar, the site of Ai, and Beitîn, the modern representative of Bethel, three-quarters of an hour to the north-west. Joshua remains all night encamped in the valley[7] before the town, the Wady Matjâ, in order to commence the onset in the morning.[8] When the king of Ai descries

[1] *JDTh.* xxi. p. 592 f. He distinguishes a second account in *vv.* 3*a*, 12 f., 14, 18, 20*c*, 26. Kuenen, *Ond.*[2] § 8, No. 20, agrees with him, and recognises in it J's account. Budde, *ZAW.* vii. p. 141 ff., acquiesces, but would prefer to regard 18*b* alone as original. *Cf.* also Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 350 (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 248 ff.). [2] *NuDtJo.*, p. 472. [3] *V.* 5.

[4] Not from Gilgal, which would naturally involve the consequence that 3*a* and 3*b* belong to separate accounts (Wellh., Kuen.). See Dillm., p. 473.

[5] The text has thirty thousand; perhaps שלשת should be read.

[6] *Narrative, etc.*, ii. p. 280; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 473.

[7] So, with Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 350 (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 248), after the reading בתוך העמק. This reading dispenses with the notion that Joshua abode still in Gilgal whilst his ambuscade had been in its place a whole day!

[8] Josh. viii. 3-9. They form an uninterrupted whole, but the connection must not be extended to *vv.* 10 and 11 (Wellh.). The fresh beginning of the discourse, the terminology (וישכם, a favourite expression of E's; the elders, as in Exod. i. ff. = E), the fresh indication of locality, compared with *v.* 9,—all show that the other account begins at *v.* 10.

Israel (in the morning) he hastens to the attack. Joshua and all Israel allow themselves to be beaten, and flee towards the wilderness, *i.e.* probably eastwards,[1] in the direction of the (barren) plateau in front of Ai, between the Wady Matjâ and the Wady Suwênît. The men of Ai follow them and leave the city open behind. 'Then the ambush arose quickly, entered into the city, and set it on fire. And when the men of Ai looked back they perceived the smoke of their city. And they had no power to flee this way or that, for the Israelites that had fled to the wilderness turned back on the pursuers. And they smote them, and they took the king alive and brought him before Joshua. And when Israel had slain the men of Ai in the field, that is, in the wilderness whither they had pursued them, they returned unto Ai and smote it with the edge of the sword, so that on that day there were slain about twelve thousand men and women.'[2]

Into this narrative we can see that an account by E has been inwrought.[3] Early in the morning Joshua musters the army (in Gilgal) and marches at its head with the elders of Israel to Ai. They encamp on the north of the city, so that the valley lies between them and Ai. This is the same situation as in J, the northern edge of the Wady Matjâ, at the southern edge of which Ai lies. Then Joshua takes five thousand men and sets them in ambush.[4] . . . Early next morning the men of Ai, the king and

[1] Dillm., *NuDtJo.*, p. 475, appears to believe that it was to the western part of the plateau. But this would involve the difficulty of making the flight, and consequently the pursuit by the men of Ai, be in the direction of the ambuscade. The contrary direction appears to agree better with the text and the facts.

[2] Josh. viii. 14*aayb*, 15, 16*a*, 17*b*, 19, 20 (20*b* also belongs necessarily to this, owing to מדבר). Moreover, the words ויבו אותם in *v.* 22 (the rest of it, like *v.* 21, is from R^{d}; *cf.* especially the formula in 22*b*), 23, 24*aab*, 25.

[3] As to E being the author see above, p. 285, Note 8.

[4] An indication of the locality must have dropped out here. The words now standing in the text: 'Between Bethel and Ai on the west side of the city,' cannot have stood in this place unless Bethel in *v.* 17 was a gloss. Seeing that this is hardly conceivable, although the word is omitted by the LXX., it must be regarded as a harmonistic addition made by R^{d} from J's *v.* 9. For if the ambush lay between Bethel and Ai the Bethelites would not be able to rush past it to help the men of Ai.

all his people make a sortie. [Israel flees] towards the appointed place in the steppe.[1] The enemy pursues Joshua and is drawn away from the city, so that there is not a man left in Ai and Bethel. [The Israelites turn back and attack the pursuers, the ambush comes up and helps,[2] the men of Ai are beaten] and are all destroyed utterly with the edge of the sword.[3] Yahvé now bids Joshua stretch out his javelin towards Ai, for He has given the city into his hand.[4] Joshua does so, and does not draw it back till Ai is utterly devoted to destruction.[5]

It is hard to say which of the two narratives is the more original. Both have peculiar and original features. And, on the whole, the divergence between them is only in subordinate points. The mention of Bethel in E is the solitary instance of a really important discrepancy. It reminds us involuntarily of that conquest of Bethel by the house of Joseph which we have already become acquainted with through J.

The easiest solution of the difficulty would be to take the word to be a mere gloss, as the LXX. suggests. But this is excluded by the fact that such a gloss in the present context would be meaningless. The LXX. have omitted Bethel because they felt that the present text would not allow of the Bethelites marching past the ambuscade between Bethel and Ai. But if Bethel belongs to E's own narrative, the important consequence follows that, according to E, the expedition was directed against Bethel as well as Ai. The account in Josh. viii., then, becomes no mere parallel to Judges i. 22 f., but the two are complementary halves of one and

[1] It is only in this way that the words give a meaning. ערבה means the same as J's מדבר. This is the place to which Joshua flees. The words in brackets must therefore have formed part of the text.

[2] Everything shows that in E the first object aimed at by the onset of the ambush is to beat the enemy, not to gain possession of the city. The city is not taken till afterwards. The supposition that the place of ambush was not the same as in J also agrees better with this.

[3] Josh. viii. 10-12 (*v.* 13 is an insertion by R^d), 14*aβδ*, 16*b*, 17*a* . . . 24*aβ*.

[4] This seems to be the place where *v.* 18 at first stood.

[5] Josh. viii. 18-26. Although some portion of what follows may possibly belong to E, this is not certain: some of it also, *e.g.*, the fate of the king, may have stood in J.

the same history. In J both halves have been preserved for us; in E the one referring to Bethel has all been lost except this small fragment.

The most plausible account we can render of the connection between E's two narratives is, that Bethel, being the neighbouring town, hastened to the help of Ai against the common foe. We might then suppose that the Bethelites who had marched out against Israel were smitten along with the inhabitants of Ai, and their city, like it, easily captured after its defenders were slain. This aspect of the matter may have induced the reviser to strike out the story because of its marked discrepancy with J. Or, on the other hand, we might adopt the more natural supposition, that E's account agreed more with J's. In that case the Bethelites escaped to their city, and Israel, after taking Ai, must have captured Bethel by means of spies and treachery, in the manner described in Judges i. 22 ff.

This omission of the taking of Bethel shows what liberties the revisers of the Book of Joshua took with the materials handed down by tradition. R^d seems to have thought hardly anything worth preserving unless he could see in it a typical significance for after-times.

We possess another example of this freedom of treatment, and one that is even more unfavourable to our historical knowledge, in the verses that succeed the story of Ai.[1] With Bethel the way to the hill-country and the possibility of an advance northwards were won. Either at once or subsequently, Israel must needs make the attempt to reach this true centre of the Holy Land.[2] We know from other quarters that it was conquered, and under Joshua too—for here his grave was afterwards shown—nay, that the pulse of Israel's life in the period of the Judges lay here. But not a scrap of information remains as to when or how it was won. The History of the Conquest is absolutely silent as to Shechem and the middle country.

[1] Josh. viii. 30-35.

[2] *Cf.* Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 478.

Considering the close connection in which that region stood with Joshua's own name, it is simply incredible that the history had nothing to say about the conquest of this highly important district. We can only suppose that this section of the history of Joshua has been lost.[1] In Josh. viii. 30-35 we possess a scanty remnant of it, apparently the only one which R^d thought of special importance. Most of it was written by D^2, but some parts may be traced to E.[2] At all events, it is to this source we owe the statement that Joshua built an altar to Yahvé on Mount Ebal, and that the people offered burnt-offerings and thank-offerings there.[3] Such a notice obviously presupposes a narrative of the conquest of the district round Shechem.

After these conflicts Joshua returns again to the fortified camp at Gilgal. There is no valid reason for thinking this another place than the Gilgal which we became acquainted with at the Passage of the Jordan.[4] No doubt there is something surprising in the fact of their returning thither. But it is not inexplicable if we remember that Israel did not consist exclusively of invading warriors, but brought with them women and children. The fortified cantonment on the Jordan could serve the latter at all times as a secure abode and the fighting men themselves as a retreat from the vicissitudes of war. This explains why not only the later sources make Joshua and Israel return to Gilgal after their martial exploits, but also why E and J take the same view.[5]

Here in Gilgal, after the return from Ai and Shechem, an event happens to Joshua the effects of which are to be felt as late as David's days. Ambassadors present themselves in the camp at Gilgal, with old sacks upon their asses and patched wine-skins. On their feet they wear torn and clouted sandals, on their bodies old clothes; the bread which they carry as their provisions is dry

[1] See Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch. d. AT.* i. p. 481.

[2] As in many other cases, Dillmann believes that D itself was the groundwork.

[3] *Vv.* 30, 31*b*. *Cf.* Josh. xxiv.

[4] On this see A. Vogel, *Luth. Zeitschr.*, 1873, p. 4 ff.; Hengstenberg, *Gesch. d. AB.* ii. p. 225 f.; Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch.* i. p. 482; Speaker's Bible, ii. p. 44.

[5] *Cf.* Budde, *ZA W.* vii. p. 131, note 2.

and crumbling. They say unto the men of Israel:[1] 'We are your servants;[2] make a covenant with us.' The men of Israel say to the strangers:[3] 'Peradventure ye dwell among us' (*i.e.* in the midst of the district which Israel was destined to subdue and depopulate) 'and how should we then make a covenant with you?' They asseverate that they are come from a far country, attracted by the name of Yahvé. They have heard what He did to the Egyptians; therefore have their elders and fellow-countrymen sent them hither and bidden them make this overture unto Israel: 'We are your servants; make therefore a covenant with us.' As a proof of their having come from afar, they point to their bread, their wine-skins, and their clothes, which were new when they brought them from their homes. Then did the men (of Israel) take of their provisions and made a covenant with them,[4] but asked not counsel at the mouth of Yahvé.[5] And after three days they heard that they were their neighbours, and dwelt in their midst.[6] They were representatives of Gibeon,[7] Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kiriath-jearim.[8]

[1] The words 'Joshua' and 'and to him,' in *v.* 6, must be struck out.

[2] It seems to me that Budde, p. 138, is right in substituting this for the words, 'we are come from a far country.' The latter words cannot be made to agree with what follows. Such a subjection as would preclude a covenant (Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 481) need not be meant. It would also be irreconcilable with that state of affairs which the authors must in any case have known of.

[3] It is very remarkable that at *v.* 7 they are designated Hivvites. For the rest see also Thenius, on 2 Sam. xxi.

[4] This must be inserted here from *v.* 15*a*; see Budde, p. 138.

[5] Budde, *ut supra*, p. 139, conjectures that Joshua, not Yahvé, may once have been the reading here.

[6] Josh. ix. 3-7, 9, 11-14, 16. If this restoration of the narratives, proposed by Budde, is correct, we possess only *one* main account of the affair, and this can have originated with no one but J. Budde's suggestion appears to me to afford quite the best solution that has hitherto been offered of the highly complicated problem presented by this chapter. At the same time it must be admitted that there are some grounds for the theory that two narratives are combined here. This is the view of Hollenberg and Wellhausen (*StKr.*, 1874, p. 496, and *JDTh.* xxi. p. 594), and especially, most recently, of Dillmann (*NuDtJo.*, p. 480). On the opinion that in E the Gibeonites submitted unconditionally (Dillm.), see above, note 2. *Vv.* 1 f., 8, 10, 15, 24 f., are from R^a or D^2; *vv.* 15*b*, 17-21 from P.

[7] According to *v.* 3.

[8] The three last towns are added in accordance with the trustworthy enumeration in *v.* 17. As to the situation of the places, *cf.* besides Riehm, *HWB.* and Baedeker,[2] especially Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 483.

After the conclusion of the compact Joshua appears.[1] He has taken no part in the negotiations, probably because he was at a distance. Now he reproaches the Gibeonites with the deceit they have practised on Israel. On them and theirs he lays the curse of perpetual servitude, as hewers of wood and drawers of water for the altar of Yahvé, but he protects them from the fury of the people, who are ready to murder the ambassadors now that their ruse is found out.[2]

§ 28. *The Historical Character of the Narrative.*

Before following the line of tradition further it is desirable to pause a while and inquire into the historical character of the material furnished by tradition which we have discovered up to now.

Up to now we have succeeded in tracing a not inconsiderable number of ancient elements belonging to the original sources, and referring to Israel's being led by Joshua across the Jordan and as far as Jericho; the provisional ideal partition of the country by him; the separation of Judah from the other tribes; Judah's advance with Simeon to the south; Joshua's successes at the head of the house of Joseph and the tribes attached thereto, up to the point where Shechem is reached.

Hitherto J has on several occasions been seen to be the only source that continued to flow for us. When there have been two ancient accounts it has been sometimes E, sometimes J, that has taken the first place, as containing the more original form. And so far as the narrative has gone it has been possible to discover in it a well-arranged and consistent progress of events. In one case, namely in the statement that the country was portioned out beforehand amongst the tribes, it was open to doubt whether the

[1] Only to this extent is Hollenberg's view, p. 496, correct, that Joshua was not mentioned originally in the Gibeonite episode; this view has been followed by the majority of investigators. See Budde, p. 138 f.

[2] *Vv.* 22 f. and 26 are part of the original account; the latter, in particular, having been worked up by R^d.

narrative was all of a piece. But we believed it possible to dispel that doubt by a closer scrutiny of the entire picture of the proceedings visible in the narrative.

All this goes a considerable way towards proving the historical reliableness of the narrative; it supplies the requisite foundation. But the relation between the sources and the events is of such a kind that when we have shown what are the oldest traditions, and have proved their mutual agreement, we have not demonstrated that things happened as they say. That can only be done if the subsequent course of events confirms it, and no other facts, ascertained by us, disprove it.

I believe, however, that the history of Joshua and the Conquest, thus far told, in the arrangement and harmony of its diverse elements which we have attempted, will stand the test.

1. *The Mode of Invasion.*—In our discussion of the Summary found in Judges i. we have already found[1] ourselves compelled to give a provisional proof that the personality of Joshua cannot be set aside in favour of the view that he was nothing but a tribal hero of the Ephraimites, or a mere eponymous hero of a clan settled in and near Timnath-heres.[2] For in the first place it is certainly no disproof of his having lived when we find that his grave was afterwards shown on Mount Ephraim. And secondly, the criticism of the sources has subverted the fundamental assumption on which this theory rests, the idea that Joshua's name does not occur in J and must have been invented by E, *i.e.* in Ephraim. With this notion the idea also falls to the ground that the entire Book of Joshua was a fiction composed by

[1] See p. 274 f. We should possess a proof from the monuments of the historical existence of Joshua, if a Phœnician inscription could be relied on which is mentioned by Procopius of Cæsarea (*De Bello Vandal.* ii. 20) and some others (Suidas, Moses of Chorene). This inscription—according to Suidas there were several—is said to have stood at Tingis (?) in Numidia, and to have been set up by Canaanites in their flight from the 'robber Joshua.' But the translation may be due to a conjecture of Procopius. *Cf.* Bertheau, *Zur Gesch.*, p. 271; Movers, *Phöniz.* ii. 2, p. 432 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* ii.[3] p. 323 f. (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 235 f.); Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch.* i. p. 488; Ency. Brit. xiii. p. 753.

[2] Judges ii. 9; to which add Josh. xix. 50 and xxiv. 30, where the place is called Timnath-serah.

E and his successors out of devotion to its mythical hero.[1] If these objections prove baseless and a full explanation can be given of the absence of Joshua from Judges i., there is nothing to justify any further unwillingness to recognise Joshua as a historical figure. On the contrary, the task that lay before Israel after the death of Moses demanded a successor of the first great leader, who should bring Israel, in his manner and in his spirit, to the Promised Land.

Joshua is an Ephraimite. Naturally he stands in close connection with his tribe. But this gives no warrant for concluding that, although a historical personage, he is only an Ephraimite tribal chief, and not at the same time leader of the united people.[2] Kuenen's weightiest reason for thinking this, when once he has admitted that Joshua appears in J's tradition, is his idea that J's original form was of a north Israelite character. We, on the contrary, believe that J is to be considered a Judæan writing, and Judges i. is a fresh proof of this. If so, it shews how distinctly the fact of Joshua's having been the commander was recognised at an early date in Judah. And, considering how soon the north and south became rivals, this can only be explained by assuming that facts were on Joshua's side.

But if Joshua was the leader and general of all Israel so long as the people acted in concert, it follows that no other than he can have conducted the crossing of the Jordan and the step required immediately after this, the conquest of Jericho, as well as the partition of the country, which must needs take place before the separation from Judah. We have already dealt with the latter point. Doubts have lately been cast on the conquest of Jericho and the closely connected fact that Israel crossed into the west country precisely at this point. Whilst Meyer[3] adheres to this as absolutely the only reliable passage in the Israelite tradition concerning the conquest of Canaan, Stade, on the other hand, feels obliged to express serious suspicions of it. In his opinion Israel

[1] Meyer, *ZA W.* i. p. 143.
[2] So Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 13, No. 14.
[3] *ZA W.* i. p. 141 f.

did not make its way into Canaan near Jericho, but crossed the Jordan considerably farther north, in the region of the Jabbok. He has been led to this mainly by his adherence to the view that in the earliest times the district opposite Jericho belonged to Moab, not to Israel.[1] We have seen reasons for deeming this a mistake and rejecting it. Stade appeals further to the history of the origin of the tribe of Benjamin.[2] The birth of Benjamin in the Holy Land is supposed to indicate that this tribe was formed by a number of clans detaching themselves from Joseph *after* the immigration into Canaan. Benjamin's territory, to which Jericho and Ai belonged, would therefore be conquered for Israel at a later date from the north.

To me there seems to be much against this. If Benjamin was not formed till some time after the conquest of Canaan, it can hardly be explained how the king of Israel was so soon afterwards chosen out of this tribe. The conflicts of the period of the Judges were not so far removed from the time of Saul as to have left no reminiscence of such a fact surviving in his day. And if the tribe of Benjamin had really been of so recent growth, it could hardly have acquired such importance under Saul as is implied in its being the tribe from which the king was to be chosen. But Stade's proposed explanation of the patriarchal history,[3] however much truth there may be in its leading ideas, seems to me to lead to contradictions as soon as it is applied in a mechanical fashion. For example, what are we to understand by Benjamin being represented on the one hand as the youngest tribe, not formed till after the arrival in Canaan, and on the other hand, as the uncle of Ephraim and Manasseh, consequently much older than they? If Benjamin was the youngest tribe, formed by separation from Ephraim, why is he then called his uncle and not his son? Stade, however, perhaps thinks that the division occurred at a time when Ephraim and Manasseh had not been separated but were regarded still as the one tribe of Joseph. In that case why is he

[1] *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 137 f.
[2] *ZA W.* i. p. 146 f.
[3] *Cf.* also *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 160 f.

called Joseph's brother instead of his son, seeing that, at least so far as size is concerned, he, rather than Ephraim and Manasseh, would be fitly called a mere son, *i.e.* sub-tribe of Joseph?[1] In short, these explanations lead to no result, and it will be well not to build too many conclusions on them. For instance, we cannot conclude from them that Benjamin did not come into existence until after the Mosaic period. But this gets rid of every difficulty in the way of believing that Jericho was taken in Joshua's time.

It is not, however, the personality of Joshua and the crossing near Jericho alone, but the entire representation which our sources give of Israel's invasion of Canaan that has been called in question. Stade[2] holds that the Hebrews reached Canaan, not as conquerors but peaceably. For a long time they led a nomadic life to the east of the Jordan. Eventually they turned to agriculture. Their population increased and they were compelled to seek an outlet on the west of the river. Individual families may have obtained land from the aborigines by purchase or agreement. The Canaanites, being superior to the Israelites, would with little trouble have repulsed any attempt at a warlike advance. In course of time one clan after another wandered in. Israel dwelling among the Canaanites became partially blended with them[3] and adopted both their culture and their holiest sanctuaries.[4] The religion alone was Israel's, and thus the mixed race eventually bore the Israelite stamp. The towns continued for some time to resist this peaceful conquest. They also were only in part overcome by force. It is not till the period of the Kings that the two constituents of the nation begin to be estranged from and hostile to each other. This ends in the subjugation of the original inhabitants.[5]

It must be unreservedly admitted that this account brings

[1] Further, what is meant by Ephraim and Manasseh being born of the daughter of an Egyptian priest? Are Ephraim and Manasseh mixed tribes of Egyptians and Hebrews? Or are they due to a mixture of Hebrew blood with that of an Egyptian priestly tribe?

[2] *ZA W.* i. p. 148 f.; *Gesch. Isr.* i. pp. 133 f., 138 f.

[3] *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 140. [4] *ZA W.* i. p. 149. [5] *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 140 f.

out excellently one important side of the actual event. Israel did not obtain the country solely by force. This is clearly proved by the many instances in which Israel and the Canaanite are seen dwelling side by side in peace during the period of the Judges. Another proof is that Israel was far from conquering the whole country under Joshua and yet had not afterwards to wage any important wars with the aborigines. At the same time, however, we must observe that whilst tradition gives one instance of mutual arrangement, it gives but *this one*, and expressly designates it as the exception to the rule. Hence it is highly questionable whether Israel's immigration into the country west of the Jordan was accomplished at first solely through peaceable negotiations, and only afterwards in a few isolated instances by force. The tradition on this subject, especially as contained in the plain and simple statements of Judges i., but also as embodied in the Book of Joshua, bears too deeply the stamp of having been drawn from facts to allow of our setting it aside on any but the most convincing grounds.

Nor must we make too much of the peace that reigned between the two sections. Israel's inability to drive out the earlier population made it necessary to come to terms with them. So far as is implied in this we certainly do miss the signs of 'mortal enmity'[1] between them. But knowing as we do that as soon as the Israelites were in a position to do it they everywhere reduced the natives to servitude,[2] we may be sure that the fairly good understanding was less a matter of principle than of temporary convenience. The fact that this subjugation was completed before Solomon[3] does not prove that it was not commenced considerably earlier. On the contrary, Saul's violent measures against the Gibeonites, who, unlike the rest of the Canaanites,[4] were under the protection of a covenant, plainly shews that he was yielding to a tendency which had long existed amongst those Israelites who were specially moved by national and theocratic feeling.[5]

The only plausible argument in favour of the settlement having

[1] Stade, *ut supra*, p. 135. [2] Judges i.27 ff. *Cf. v.* 21 ; Josh. xiii. 13.
[3] 2 Sam. xxi.1 ff. [4] 1 Kings ix. 21. [5] 2 Sam. xxi. 2*b*.

been effected peaceably is the superiority of the Canaanites over the Israelites, which finds expression in many passages. But that superiority is sufficiently explained by the fact of Israel's oft-proved inability to conquer the towns and the lowlands. That of itself implies that they afterwards lived side by side with the Canaanites and were under the necessity of entering into friendly arrangements with them. It will be found very difficult to prove that the Canaanites, though able in part to keep their fortified towns, and by means of their chariots to assert their superiority over Israel in battles on the plains, were also able to shut off Israel from the hill-country, the district which the older tradition looks on as conquered by Israel. If Israel advanced with a fairly united front it must have been an imposing power in comparison with the Canaanites, who possessed but little homogeneity of organisation and were split up into separate republican commonwealths. The earlier inhabitants, as many tokens shew, were, moreover, a race, the long-standing civilisation of which had degenerated into immorality which probably involved weakness. Their knowledge of the art of war would impress the Israelites more than their natural vigour. Israel confronted them as a people in all the freshness of unspoiled youthful vigour, accustomed to severe fighting and hard privation. Where the two fought with equal weapons Israel scarcely needed to shun the arbitrament of war.

We believe then that these positions are to be adhered to:—Joshua marched into the western land at the head of Israel; Israel crossed the Jordan near Jericho; and the entrance into Canaan was a warlike, rather than a peaceable one.

2. *The Several Events.*—With this as our starting-point there will be no difficulty in forming an opinion respecting the historical value of the rest of the narrative. It is true that the accounts of the Passage of the Jordan and the conquest of Jericho are not in perfect harmony amongst themselves. Yet they present a picture which, in its main features, is clear and transparent. They exhibit Israel to us passing the Jordan through Yahvé's miraculous

help, and in the strength thereof conquering Jericho. It is impossible at this distance of time to determine in what way the details of the two events occurred. But if Israel was conscious of having experienced his God's miraculous aid in an extraordinary degree at this critical commencement of the attack on Canaan, who will venture *on that account* to relegate the whole to the realm of fiction?[1]

To the crossing of the Jordan the narrative of the circumcision of Israel attaches itself. Here again we must recognise a genuine historical reminiscence, although it has been freely recast. The 'reproach of Egypt,'[2] which is now rolled away from Israel, makes it absolutely certain, as the history of Moses also indicates,[3] that the Israelites in Egypt were uncircumcised.[4] Circumcision may therefore have been substantially first adopted by Israel after they reached Canaan, or at all events, the custom may then have become universal. And if P,[5] as well as J,[6] regards circumcision as known and practised as early as the patriarchal times, the very fact of J's sharing in this tradition shews that it contains no contradiction of our narrative.[7] The true history of the rite is rather this: the practice of circumcision began in early times, but was not carried out universally; in Egypt it fell out of use, and did not become universal till now.[8] Circumcision is not ordained by the law, but is there taken for granted as carried on from the beginning. This is the strongest confirmation of the view that it did not originate in the Mosaic or post-Mosaic period, but was familiar to the people from the earliest times.[9]

[1] Nöldeke, *Unters.*, p. 95, finds in the crossing of the Jordan the mere reflex of the passage through the Red Sea. It would be more reasonable to derive the story of the march through the Red Sea from the crossing of the Jordan. For if Israel was certain of anything it was of the fact that it once came over the Jordan.

[2] Josh. v. 9.

[3] Exod. xxiv. 24 f. *Cf.* Wellh. *Prol.*[2] p. 382 (Eng. Trans. p. 360).

[4] See Ewald, *Altert.*[3] p. 126 f. (Eng. Trans. p. 94); Hollenberg, *StKr.*, 1874, p. 493 f.; Wellh. *Gesch. Isr.*, p. 364 f.; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 460.

[5] Gen. xvii.

[6] Gen. xxxiv.

[7] Thus Lagarde, *Symmicta*, i. p. 117; Wellh. *Gesch. Isr.*, p. 365; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.*, pp. 111, 423.

[8] *Cf.* Dillm. *Gen.*[5] p. 254.

[9] See also Riehm, *HWB.*, Art. 'Beschneidung.'

We saw that in the most ancient tradition Joshua's leadership of all Israel terminated with the conquest of Jericho. Judah now separates, together with its connected tribes and with Simeon, and conquers his own district. The manner in which Judah's exploits against Adoni-bezek are narrated; the description of the conquest of Hebron by Caleb and of Debir by Othniel; the frank confession of Judah's incompetency in the plains and in face of the strong walls of Jebus; the portraiture of the brave warriors Caleb and Othniel; the interweaving of the Achsah episode, with its glorification of chivalry and female beauty—all this bears so plainly the colours of life that we have no right to doubt its being historical.[1] To say that these events may have actually occurred but belong to a later period[2] is only to increase the difficulty of believing them to have been historical. For the period of the Judges has its own conflicts, and has preserved many valuable reminiscences of them.

Joshua, henceforth leader of the house of Joseph and the tribes provisionally connected with it, now attacks the hill-country of Ephraim and takes Ai and Bethel. The accounts of these proceedings have preserved the recollection that the conquest of Ai was preceded by a disaster and the city ultimately taken by stratagem, also that Bethel fell into the hands of the conquerors through the co-operation of a treacherous inhabitant. Here, too, we are bound to recognise historical material.

It is not possible for us now to make out all the details of Joshua's march against the hill-country of Ephraim proper. When he has mastered it, as far as, and probably inclusive of, Shechem, he leads his army back to Gilgal.[3] At this place, as it would seem during a temporary absence of Joshua's, the people are deceived by the ambassadors of Gibeon and her daughter-towns. It is not quite easy to fit this narrative into the rest of the story of the events during Joshua's time. This explains the

[1] So Meyer, *ZAW.* i. p. 141, and Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 137; 'not founded on any tradition whatsoever of historical occurrences.'

[2] So probably Wellh. *Proleg.*[2] p. 382 (Eng. Trans. p. 360).

[3] On this see above, p. 289.

somewhat numerous attempts which have been made to prove that the alliance with Gibeon was not made till later in the period of the Judges,[1] or even as late as just before Saul.[2] On the other hand it seems to me that the indubitably ancient tradition which tells of a great decisive battle near Gibeon, occasioned by a coalition of Canaanite kings against that city, can only be accounted for by the alliance in question, which the Canaanites would naturally regard as treasonable.

Two main reasons are adduced in favour of the later date of the alliance with Gibeon. The Israelites observe the contract into which they have been cozened, but they reduce the Gibeonites to the position of slaves of the sanctuary. Stade holds [3] that this idea cannot have arisen earlier than Solomon. For it was he who first reduced to serfdom the previously unsubdued remnants of the aboriginal population, whereas in David's reign the Gibeonites retained their perfect freedom. But if the statement referred to [4] is examined more closely, it becomes clear that it says nothing about either dependence or independence on the part of the Gibeonites. What they rise against is not Saul's purposed withdrawal of their perfect freedom, but the bloody extermination of them which he has begun. Hence it is quite possible and intrinsically probable that in Saul's time they already found themselves in a certain state of servitude.[5] With this it agrees that when the context explains the peculiar relation between Gibeon and Israel, it does not at all create the impression that the covenant had been made by Saul or some little while before him.[6] Rather is it regarded as a thing which came down from former generations, an alliance made by the sons of Israel long before, which Saul was now arbitrarily breaking after it had stood for centuries.

Budde[7] mentions a further reason. The Song of Deborah

[1] Budde, *ZA W.* vii. p. 135.
[2] Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 161.
[3] *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 135 f.
[4] 2 Sam. xxi. 1 ff.
[5] Nor does the altar necessarily indicate a later date. The place of sacrifice in Gibeon itself may have been originally intended.
[6] *Cf.* 2 Sam. xxi. 2: 'The sons of Israel have sworn to them.'
[7] *ZA W.* vii. p. 135.

shews that after Joshua's time there was a deep cleavage between Judah and the house of Joseph. For Deborah, Judah is as though it did not exist. The only possible explanation, in Budde's opinion, is that a strip of Canaanite territory, interrupting the connection between the centre and the south of the land, ran from Jebus, which certainly was in the hands of the Canaanites, to the sea. But this Canaanite wedge could not run uninterruptedly as far as Jebus, unless Gibeon and the towns belonging to it,[1] Beeroth, Chephirah, Kiriath-jearim, as well as the surrounding places, Jebus,[2] Gezer,[3] Shaalbim, Aijalon,[4] continued to be Canaanite in Deborah's day, *i.e.* unless the alliance was not formed before the later part of the period of the Judges.

This argument also is by no means conclusive. For if the enemy held Jebus, which dominated the vicinity as an almost impregnable fortress, and if on the other side they held Gezer,[1] Shaalbim and Aijalon, Gibeon alone, though a fortified place, could not have very well served Israel for a base of operations. Yet more markedly would this be the case if Gibeon no longer possessed complete independence in the times of the Judges and consequently was discontented and unreliable. Moreover we know hardly anything definite as to the circumstances of Judah itself in the period of the Judges. Its omission by Deborah when she surveys the tribes of Israel is in any case surprising, and the difficulty is not removed however extended we imagine this Canaanite line of separation betwixt Israel and Judah.

But the decisive weight seems to me to fall on the already mentioned fact that an important battle was fought at Gibeon in Joshua's time and is brought by tradition into the closest connection with the peace concluded between Israel and Gibeon. If that fight proves to be historical, there can be no further doubt as to the alliance having been concluded. Our first business therefore is to examine the battle of Gibeon.

[1] See above, p. 290.
[2] Judges i. 21.
[3] Judges i. 29.
[4] Judges i. 35.
[5] *Cf.* the Maps: Kiepert, *Neue Handkarte von Palästina*, 1883; Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. opposite p. 140; Droysen, *Hist. Handatlas*, p. 4.

§ 29. *The Events that followed the Alliance with Gibeon.*

1. *The Battle of Gibeon.*—The following is the state of the case as presented by the sources. Interwoven in the narrative of the occurrences[1] that followed the alliance with Gibeon we find a fragment of an ancient song which immediately catches the attention of the reader; it is accompanied with a short explanatory text:

'Then spake (= sang) Joshua[2] of Yahvé[3] *in the day when Yahvé delivered up*[4] *the Amorites before Israel*; and he said in the sight of Israel:

'Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon—and moon, in the valley of Aijalon[5]:

And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed—until the people had avenged themselves of their enemies.

'Behold, this is written in the Book of the Upright: *And the sun stayed in the midst of heaven and hasted not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before or after, on which Yahvé hearkened unto the voice of a man; for Yahvé fought for*[6] *Israel.*[7]

The italicised words in the foregoing translation are readily distinguished from the rest by their form and contents as additions made by D^2. They correspond in linguistic usage with D^2 and make no fresh contribution to the narrative, but simply furnish further explanation of the rest of the text.[8] Leaving aside these additions we have in the rest a passage which in any case is very

[1] Josh. x.

[2] Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 50, wishes, without reason, to delete Joshua here again. See also Budde, p. 146.

[3] = in praise of Yahvé. דבר followed by ל does not mean 'to speak to one,' except in isolated instances. If we had here an address to Yahvé the verb at the beginning of the song could not be in the imperative but must be in the third person.

[4] For the phrase כתן לפני *cf.* Deut. i. 8, 21, and frequently.

[5] *Scil.* 'So was it then commanded,' or, 'thus spake Yahvé.

[6] יי נלחם לישראל: *cf.* Deut. i. 30; iii. 22; xx. 4. [7] Josh. x. 12-14.

[8] In *v.* 12 the words 'in the day,' etc. are a freshly inserted explanation of 'then spake' etc.; *vv.* 13 and 14 explain the song. *Cf.* further Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 330 (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 235); Hollenberg, *StKr.*, 1884, p. 498.

old and most probably comes from E,[1] which appeals also to that Book of the Upright with which we have already made acquaintance.

The passage tells us of a great battle fought near Gibeon and Aijalon. Joshua celebrates it in a song which was afterwards sung in memorial of it and in praise of Yahvé.[2] He briefly depicts what happened during or before the battle: the miraculous aid rendered by sun and moon made it possible to annihilate the foe.

What is the historical foundation of the song? It is said the words of poets are to be understood poetically[3] and not as matter-of-fact prose. In support of this the Song of Deborah can be appealed[4] to. There the fighting of the stars is nothing but a highly poetical figure, a concrete, graphic expression of the idea that Yahvé miraculously caused all things to work happily together for Israel's triumph. Similarly it is maintained that in our song we have a picture of long continued battle and pursuit.[5] But whilst we admit to the full the poetical character of the passage, the far more definite form of this song is naturally explained as arising from a clearly-defined situation, the memory of which lived on in Joshua's mind, and from special occurrences on the day of battle. It is not a mere co-operation of sun and moon in the fight, but their actual standing still is spoken of. This can signify nothing but an extraordinary duration of the day of battle which allowed Joshua to finish his martial day's work. The daylight held out till the work of vengeance on the enemy was completed. Joshua has poetically glorified this in the song, as a standing still of the sun, because he knew of no other explana-

[1] E's habit of quoting from ancient collections of songs is in favour of this (*cf.* Num. xx. f.). Dillmann, p. 488, makes D, probably attaching his work to E, the author of *vv.* 12-15.

[2] This results from the meaning given by our translation to וידבר ליי. *V.* 13*aα* belongs to the song. D[2] in *v.* 14 has taken the words as a prayer to Yahvé, and interpreted them accordingly as spoken during the battle. But see above, p. 302, note 3.

[3] Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 489.

[4] Judges v. 20.

[5] 'It was a long fight and pursuit, and when people looked back on it the impression was as if the day itself had been prolonged.'—Dillmann, *ut supra*.

tion. The Deuteronomic reviser[1] has, in his manner, embellished yet further the interpretation which the song itself gave and has turned it into matter-of-fact prose. If the interpretation does not satisfy us who live under the influence of the Copernican view of the world, we are not on that account justified in simply relegating the event to the realm of poetic imagery. The fact of a striking continuance of daylight remains, though we may not know the natural law through which it was brought about.[2] The song itself, to say nothing of the appended explanation, proves Israel's belief that a miracle was wrought. But if the event is historically testified to, in the manner we have shown, we cannot even at the present day find fault with the religious view of history which sees in the marvellous duration of the day a mighty interposition of divine omnipotence on behalf of the chosen people.[3]

A battle at Gibeon can therefore be certainly proved from the very oldest sources. It is true that neither the immediate context nor the song itself enables us to understand the occasion. Consequently nothing remains to us but conjectures if we do not attend to the wider context. But these also lead to one certain result. Though the fight took place at Gibeon, it cannot in any case have been *against* Gibeon. For the tradition leaves no doubt as to the fact that the inhabitants of this city, in contrast with their fellow-countrymen, were on friendly terms with Israel. On the side of the Canaanites this friendly relation is looked on as strange, and, in its character, abnormal; this alone would make the hostility of their own countrymen more likely. It is not Gibeon

[1] To him is due the turn of expression at *v.* 14b, which makes the words of the song seem like a prayer of Joshua's. This of course does not exclude the possibility that in E also the lengthening of the day may *as a matter of fact* have followed on Joshua's prayer. But in E the song was not his prayer. The distinction has therefore to do with literature rather than with facts.

[2] Dillmann's idea, p. 490, that the obscuring of the sun made it totally impossible to estimate the time, will hardly be any longer insisted on, unless we first admit that the sun was obscured.

[3] For the abundant literature dealing with this narrative, *cf.* especially Winer, *Realswörterb.* i. p. 613; Zöckler, *Beweis des Glaubens*, iv. p. 248 ff.; Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch.* i. p. 485; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 490.

that is beaten in that battle, but the Canaanites who have attacked it because they regard its relation towards Israel as treachery against the common cause.

Thus far are we brought by the natural state of the case,[1] if we look only at the song itself as the most reliable foundation for our knowledge of these occurrences. If it further appears that the larger framework into which the song is fitted corresponds with this we shall have reached a strong presumption in its favour.

The framework in which the song stands is a narrative of a coalition formed by Canaanite princes to punish Gibeon for its covenant with Israel. At its head stands Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, who is joined by Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon. Gibeon calls on Joshua for help, and he marches up from Gilgal to give it. He surprises the enemy, defeats them at Gibeon, and pursues them towards Beth-horon. Whilst they are endeavouring to escape by way of the descent[2] from the Upper to the Lower Beth-horon a hailstorm[3] from Yahvé cuts them to pieces and kills multitudes. The song then describes the protracted pursuit and the help which God continued to give during it to Israel. After the destruction of the foe Joshua returns to the camp at Gilgal.[4]—Making a fresh beginning, and therefore following another source, the same chapter then gives a detailed account of the continuation of the pursuit to Makkedah, and the execution of the allied kings who were hidden in a cave at Makkedah.[5]

[1] Against Budde, *ZA W.* vii. p. 146, who believes there was a battle at Gibeon the motives of which are unknown.

[2] For the position of the ancient Beth-horon and the modern Bêt ʿÛr el-fôqa and et-taḥta, see Riehm, *HWB.* p. 180, and Baedeker, p. 142.

[3] Volck, in *PRE.*[2] vii. p. 121, thinks of meteoric stones.

[4] Josh. x. 1-11, 15. If we omit the additions made by D^2, verses 1-15 are a unity and probably from E. So Dillmann, except that, like Hollenberg, Wellhausen and Budde, he separates 12-15 as added by D. But although 12-15 have undergone considerable revision they belonged at first to E. *V.* 15 does not quite harmonise with what follows and must therefore in any case belong to the original source, *i.e.* E. For the same reasons and appealing to כל ישראל, Dillmann, *NuDtJo.*, pp. 488, 490, ascribes it to D.

[5] Josh. x. 16-28, probably from J (*cf.* 21*b* with Exod. xi. 7 ; *v.* 24, איש יש׳,), but revised, especially *v.* 25. *Vv.* 28-43 is a free addition by D^2, and runs counter in several respects to the older tradition ; see below.

In considering this account we must first leave aside the discrepancy which arises from the premature mention of the return to Gilgal in *v.* 15.[1] From what we have already ascertained as to the correspondence of its contents with the facts of the case we might at once accept it as historical were it not that unexpected obstacles are presented by the details of its statements. Hebron, as we saw, was conquered by Judah long before, likewise Debir, the latter of which is also conquered in the continuation of the narrative[2] which is due to D^2. It is at least certain that the king of Hebron cannot have been a member of the confederacy.

This amounts to the admission that the battle of Gibeon, because it was a brilliant victory, often celebrated in song, soon gave rise to certain additions to the facts of the original. This ought not to be denied for the sake of a false system of harmonising.[3] For Hebron was conquered by Caleb. But on the other side it is quite as unjustifiable to throw overboard the whole narrative of a Judæo-Philistine coalition against Joshua simply because Hebron has been erroneously brought in.[4] The coalition is too well established by what we know of the battle of Gibeon and all the surroundings of the event to make that allowable. Jebus, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon are directly or indirectly stated in Judges i. to have not been conquered by Judah; hence they both could and must, in all probability, take common action against Gibeon.

It is indeed attempted to prove the narrative unhistorical by referring especially to Adoni-zedek.[5] Instead of this name the LXX. read Ἀδωνιβεζέκ. This suggests the idea that it is simply the contest of the Judæans with Adoni-bezek, related in Judges i., that is here reproduced and in accordance with the tendency of the later narrators transformed into a contest of Joshua and all

[1] As to its meaning, the verse would come better after *v.* 27.

[2] Josh. x. 39, where the mistake also occurs of slaying over again the king of Hebron who has long been dead. *Cf. v.* 26.

[3] See Keil, *Joshua*, p. 88; Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch.* i. p. 486.

[4] Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. p. 133; Budde, *ZA W.* vii. pp. 154 f., 157.

[5] Wellh. *Einl.*[4] p. 182; Budde, *ZA W.* p. 147 ff.

Israel against Jerusalem and Judah. Budde[1] in fact makes an ingenious attempt to prove that Adoni-bezek was not really king of Bezek but of Jerusalem. And when we are thus reminded of that other king of Jerusalem, Melchizedek, who also belongs to the realm of legend, it seems as though all the threads were beautifully brought together, from which the web of fiction is woven that here lies around the name of Adoni-bezek.

It must be allowed that the theory sounds remarkably well. At the same time we can hardly avoid the suspicion that the agreement is too perfect. Plausible as is the ring of the hypothesis it goes to work with motives too transparent to awake our confidence.

It is indeed striking that the LXX. read Aboni-bezek. But it is much easier to believe that a mistaken reading, occasioned by Judges i., crept into the text, than that Adoni-zedek here, and Bezek instead of Jerusalem as his capital, at Judges i., were inserted in the Massoretic text subsequent to the Alexandrine translation. If the later reviser felt no scruple in making these extensive alterations and was so much in earnest in getting rid of contradictions, why did he leave Hebron untouched two verses lower down[2] when he could have changed it at his pleasure for another actual or feigned name? If in the one case he has made use of measures for smoothing away discrepancies in this deliberate, well-planned fashion, he is guilty of a self-contradiction which breaks the neck of the whole hypothesis, by failing suddenly to employ the same manœuvre in a second case in the same context where it is equally necessary. For we have not here a copyist's hasty and incidental alteration, such as gave rise to the LXX. reading.[3] The innovator is supposed to place Josh. x. and Judges i. before him and compare them to see whether they agree; would he alter the one passage, and let the other equally great difficulty stand untouched? That is a much harder riddle than

[1] *ZAW.* p. 149. [2] Josh. x. 3.

[3] As to the inferior quality of the LXX. text in Joshua, see Dillm. *NuDtJo.* p. 690.

the origin of the name Adoni-bezek from a writer of the LXX. who remembered its occurrence in Judges i.

This does not involve the assertion that Joshua conquered the south and its fortified towns. In so far as that is stated later in the narrative it appears due to a misapprehension on the part of the later reviser.[1] The conquest of the south was the task of Judah and Simeon. Hebron and Debir are conquered by them; the rest of the cities hardly so at present. Joshua confined himself to defeating and destroying the enemy.

2. *The Rest of the Narratives.*—The tradition tells us of another, final feat of arms of Joshua's. At the opposite end of Canaan, in the extreme north,[2] Jabin, king of Hazor, allies himself with a number of North Canaanite kings to fight against Joshua. They encamp at the waters of Merom, which can scarcely be any other place[3] than the Lake of Huleh.[4] Here Joshua, obeying the divine command, takes the enemy by surprise and destroys them utterly.[5]

Here again we must suppose that the account rests on a historical foundation, although it is impossible now to make out the precise course of events. Doubtless Joshua had occasion to wage isolated wars with the northern Canaanites after conquering the centre of the country, possibly some considerable time after. The tradition which subsequently took shape in D^2 and P has interpreted the isolated exploits of Joshua in the south and north, presupposed in this and the preceding chapter, as the completion of the conquest of the country by Joshua. And thus there follows a list of the kings defeated by Joshua,[6] in which a number of

[1] *Vv.* 28-43. *Cf.* also the examples above, p. 306, note 2.

[2] Probably to be sought in the neighbourhood of Kadesh-Naphtali, whether at the modern Tell Harrawi (Guérin, *Gal.* ii. p. 363 ff; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 495) or at Tell Khuraibeh (Robinson, *LBR.*, p. 364; Riehm, *HWB.*, p. 583; Bertheau, *Richt.*,[2] p. 83 f.).

[3] So Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*[3] ii. p. 356 (Eng. Trans. ii. p. 253); Hitzig, *Gesch. Isr.* p. 103; Köhler, *Bilb. Gesch.* i. p. 487; Dillm. *NuDtJo.* p. 497. Against this see also Keil in the Commentary on Josh. xi. 5, and Smend, in Riehm's *HWB.* p. 983 f.

[4] On it *cf.* Baedeker, p. 375.

[5] Josh. xi. 1-9. The verses contain a narrative sketched by D^2 probably based on (E or) J. What follows (*vv.* 10-23) is an amplification freely contributed by D^2.

[6] Josh. xii.

districts[1] are included which the older sources represent as not having been conquered at that time. It does not therefore describe Joshua's own successes, but mistakenly transfers to Joshua a state of affairs which came about later.[2]

Here the history of the Conquest forsakes us. The succeeding chapters of the Book of Joshua[3] belong almost entirely to D^2 and P, and present an ideal picture of the division of the country amongst the various tribes. They proceed on the assumption that Joshua completely subdued the entire country, leaving hardly anything unconquered. In so far as this assumption is erroneous that division may also have attributed to former times a state of affairs which really belonged to later days, in the belief that Joshua himself produced it. Precious as those chapters are, as historical and geographical memorials of the abodes of the various tribes, they cannot be used directly as sources from which to learn the state of affairs in Joshua's time. So far as any information on that point is to be had, we can only seek it in the oldest constituents of the chapters. Such constituents are to be found, though not in considerable numbers. In part, that is, so far as they belong to J, we have already set them forth. But some of them may also be traced to E. These must now be considered in connection with the notices from J which we are already acquainted with.

Up to this point the narrative has been able, almost without a break, to follow the clue provided by the Summary in J. At every point it has been evident that the account can be harmonised with the Summary and is rightly guided by it. Joshua crosses the Jordan, conquers Jericho, divides the land, then allows Judah to go south, proceeds himself with the house

[1] *Cf. v.* 21 f. with Judges i. 27 f.

[2] The consciousness that the conquest is incomplete is still felt at Josh. xiii. 1, probably indeed in a different sense from that expressed by the present context (D^2). *V.* 1 is older.

[3] Josh. xiii. ff. No agreement has yet been reached as to the analysis of the sources : on the chapters in question see Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 496 ff. ; Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 6, No. 49 ff., § 7, No. 27 ff. ; Dillm. *NuDtJo.*

of Joseph to the hill-country, and after winning it, has still to wage a few battles in defence of what has been acquired.

Now that we have reached the close there emerge unexpectedly some remnants of a slightly different idea of the story, deviating in at least one leading point, and not observable till now. According to it seven tribes had not obtained any territory at the close of the Conquest, and because this has been neglected hitherto, Joshua apportions their shares to them now. We shall not be mistaken in attributing this view of matters to the source E.

We have previously come across a fragment, in all probability belonging to E, which deals with the division of the country.[1] According to it E, as well as J, must have told how Joshua undertook to divide the territory ere the western tribes separated into two main branches after the conquest of Jericho. In Joshua xvii. 14 ff., J, like E, distinctly presupposes this concerning the house of Joseph. J also assumes that there was such a division by lot for Judah and Simeon,[2] probably also for the other tribes.[3]

But besides the remnants of ancient sources already educed from the Book of Joshua, we now come across an ancient fragment[4] which asserts that after the martial exploits hitherto performed by Joshua, there still remained seven tribes that had obtained no inheritance, but now at last had one assigned them. It is obvious that this element of the tradition does not agree with J. Consequently we must assign it to E, and thus we perceive that in this source Judah-Simeon and Ephraim-Manasseh, the tribes that headed the forward movement, were the only ones that received an inheritance at first, *i.e.* the only ones authorised to conquer a definite district. When this was done the land they had conquered was assigned to them, and there seem also to be

[1] Josh. xvii. 14 f. See above, p. 266, note 4.

[2] גורלי, גורלך, in Judges i. 3.

[3] The entire situation in Judges i., as well as the question, 'Who shall go up first?' *V.* 1 suggests this.

[4] Josh. xviii. 2-6, 8-10.

still some accounts of this in E.[1] Then the seven other tribes, who, according to Joshua's reproach,[2] had long had opportunities for providing themselves with settlements, have these assigned them by Joshua, and that by means of the lot.[3] Probably this was originally done at Shechem.[4] One is inclined to regard this as the most original description of what actually happened.

Joshua has now finished his life-work. E, with wise caution, does not assert that the seven tribes conquered their districts thoroughly, but J, as has already appeared, tells us what portions of their districts the respective tribes were not able to conquer. *Joshua's life-work accordingly consists in beginning the Conquest, and carrying it to such a conclusion as ensured Israel's future in the land.* By his exertions this was reached. In Shechem he dismisses the tribes, after reminding them of Yahvé's benefits, and urging them to be faithful to Him.

The section in which Joshua's farewell is narrated is of peculiar significance, much revised, but rich in old and valuable notices.[5] The main stem of it probably belongs to E, and we can scarcely suppose that the statements respecting the early history here made are at variance with those given by that writer.[6]

[1] Josh. xvi. 1-3 (יצא = 'came out of the urn,' as explained by Dillmann in *v.* 1, may at all events suit the present context; originally the word meant the same as in *v.* 2); possibly also xiv. 13-19, but this is uncertain; moreover parts of chap. xviii. (See Dillmann, p. 538.) [2] Josh. xviii. 3.

[3] Josh. xviii. 6. [4] *Cf.* Wellh. *JDTh.* xxi. p. 597.

[5] Josh. xxiv. On this see especially Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 7, No. 27; § 8, No. 16; Dillm. *NuDtJo.* p. 583 ff.

[6] See against Kuen. *Ond.*[2] § 8, No. 16, in Dillm. *NuDtJo.*, p. 585 f.

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to Her Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 41. Note 3, for 1846, read 1864.

63. Note 7, after 48f., read (Eng. Trans. pp. 25, 46 f.).

111. Note 6, after pp. 54-85, read (Eng. Trans. pp. 52-82).

169. Note 1, after p. 336, read (Eng. Trans. p. 318).

207. Note 1, after p. 23, line 1, read (Eng. Trans. p. 22), and after p. 374, line 2, read (Eng. Trans. p. 352).

210. Note 4, after p. 31, read (Eng. Trans. p. 21).